AGAINST THE PERFIDIOUS PRINCIPLES OF MOHAMMED

CARDINAL JUAN DE TORQUEMADA, O.P.

Sonnet 4.6 Translation

English Translation of

AGAINST THE PERFIDIOUS PRINCIPLES OF MOHAMMED

By John of Torquemada, Cardinal of St. Sixtus

Rome, From the Press of Guilielmus Facciotti, 1606

WITH THE PERMISSION OF SUPERIORS

[Translated by @ofsaintthomas on X]

DEDICATION

To the Most Blessed and Most Clement Lord and Father, Lord Pius,Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church

JOHN OF TORQUEMADA, Priest of the Roman Church at the Title of St. Mary Across the Tiber, Cardinal commonly called of St. Sixtus, after humble recommendation, kisses the blessed feet.

I AM at an advanced age, Most Blessed Father, and my spirit rejoiced not a little, giving thanks to the inspirer of your holy zeal, understanding that the flame of charity of Your Beatitude burns so greatly for defending the faith, for the peace and quiet of the Christian people, that you hasten to apply all care, all vigilance, and all prudent study to meet and oppose the fury of the persecution by which at present the Turk is disturbing and infesting the Christian people through the various provinces of the world, so that he might altogether destroy them.

Furthermore, since the fulfillment of this holy desire of yours exceeds the resources of the Roman Church and concerns all the Christian Republic — especially since Turkish ambition aspires not to ecclesiastical dignities, but rather to empires and kingdoms, to secular principalities, and to the dominion of the greatest communities — so that in order to advance the purpose of such laudable solicitude, Your Holiness most prudently deliberated, notwithstanding the frequent infirmities from which you often labor and other many inconveniences, to accommodate your presence at a nearby place to the ultramontane Provinces, where, with the Christian Princes meeting (to whom the guardianship of the Church has been divinely entrusted), a council should be celebrated, in which with the mature counsel of all intervening, it might be treated by what counsel of providence, by what art, by what ingenuity, and by what progress and means it might be possible to resist the fury of the aforesaid

persecution by which the Turk rages against the Christian people, and the boldness of his power might be broken. A thing truly worthy of commendation and a most prudent deliberation.

Who henceforth will be so reckless that, if some unhappy chance should befall Christendom through the Turk, he would impute it to your negligence? When I was about to attend that council at the command of Your Holiness, I intended not only to offer my intelligence liberally for the health of the Christian Republic and all my faculties, as all the faithful are obliged to do according to their portion of strength, but also armed with the armor of David — that is, the armor of divine Wisdom — to meet the enemy. It came into my mind to collect in a certain little treatise, written in these few days, the clearest and most solid stones from the stream of sacred scriptures, by which the forehead of the most condemned enemy of Christ, Muhammad, whom the Turks (whom we commonly call Saracens), deceived by diabolical cunning, venerate and worship as a true Prophet of God, might be so struck, that his sect being proved clearly false, erroneous, execrable, and pernicious to all, the Christian people might the more ardently inflame themselves for the conquest and destruction of his sect and nation, and rise up more vigorously. Trusting therefore in the help of our Savior Jesus Christ, whose cause is being acted upon, I undertook this labor having collected my spirits, Most Blessed Father — hasty as it is, and oppressed enough by the inconveniences of my old age — both because of the zeal of the Christian Faith, and in order to accomplish something pleasing to Your Holiness, and also in order that I might by the sparks of my words somewhat nourish the holy ardor of your spirit for the protection of the Christian people.

And if I wished to write something after others who are found to have written something against Muhammad, this should not be attributed to arrogance or

temerity, but in a certain way to necessity: because their treatises inclined rather to weave the history of the origin and life of Muhammad, and his fables, than to refute his pernicious errors against the Catholic Faith and good morals — which seems best to follow. I do not promise, however, to drive away all his errors and false follies in this hasty study of ours, since to go through his individual errors, because they are almost infinite, would be the work not of a small treatise, but of a very large volume and long study. Nonetheless I shall take care, with all my power and the Lord assisting, to drive away and break with the invincible weapons of sacred scriptures and irrefragable arguments his principal errors, which seem most greatly to contradict and impugn the Catholic Faith.

But this I intend most especially to demonstrate: that Muhammad was a Pseudo-prophet and seducer of his nation, and that his law proceeded not from God but from the Devil, the suggester of impiety; and that thus his sect, gathered from all the errors of the Heretics as a certain cesspool, which when I shall have accomplished, I believe it will bring no small usefulness to the holy desire of Your Beatitude. For I judge that through this it will be ministered to the weak, who are often moved by slight arguments, the firmament of stability of our most holy faith; to the strong, however, to those to whom it has befallen to enter the contest of disputation against the Saracens on behalf of the faith, some armament for the defense of the faith is furnished; the Christian people is also excited thereby to take up more vigorously and pursue the war against the Turks.

This little treatise, composed among other occupations with such mediocrity of mine, as quickly as I could and almost furtively, I offer to Your Holiness, which shall not regard it greatly, since it is not polished in beauty of speech and the art of oratory in which you are supremely learned. For thus it has been

transmitted in lean oration and crude style, partly because I gave more effort to Theological wisdom than to the study of speaking, partly because in such contests it is the power of ingenuity that is rather required to sharply refute errors than the ornament of words, and partly also because, as Lactantius testifies, God willed this to be the nature of things, that simple and naked truth should be the more lucid, and sufficiently adorned by itself; but falsehood pleases by an alien appearance, because being corrupt through itself it vanishes and flows away, unless it is painted around by ornament sought from elsewhere and adorned.

For I undertook this work — greater perhaps than my abilities can sustain — not in confidence of eloquence but of truth. In which, if there is anything to be corrected, let Your Holiness, who possesses the highest intelligence and holds the Chair of Ecclesiastical teaching, correct and amend it.

CHAPTER I

On the Description of Muhammad

THE Blessed John the Evangelist, to whom, by the prerogative of virginity, it was given to explore the secrets of heaven more deeply than the others, describes in his Book of Revelations the tribulations of the Church from his own time to the end of the World, so that against these we might be found fortified with the shield of patience; since, as Gregory says, blows hurt less that are foreseen. Among these, foreseeing and describing for us the persecution of the Church that was to come through Muhammad and his followers, he describes it for us in the following words, Apoc. 13, saying: "I saw another beast ascending from the earth, and it had two horns like those of a Lamb, and it spoke like a Dragon."

And it had the power of the first beast before it, and made the earth and its inhabitants adore the first beast, whose mortal wound was healed; and it performed great signs, and even caused fire to come down from heaven to earth in the sight of all men; and it led astray the inhabitants of the earth by means of the signs which it was given it to do in the sight of the beast; telling the inhabitants of the earth to make an image of the beast, which had the wound of the sword; and it was given to it to give spirit to the image of the beast, and to the image; and to cause that whoever would not adore the image of the beast should be killed. In these words the reprobate Muhammad comes to be condemned and impugned by all the faithful above all perverse Heretics, on account of eight evils which God notes in the proposed words of the Evangelist John.

First, because he was most wicked in life, when it is said: I saw another beast.

Second, because he was most greedy for plunder, when it is said: Ascending from the earth.

Third, because he was the worst simulator of holiness, when it is said: And it had two horns like those of a Lamb.

Fourth, because he was most virulent in doctrine, when it is said: And it spoke like a Dragon.

Fifth, because he was most studious in doing evils, when it is said: And it had the power of the first beast before it, doing everything.

Sixth, because he was most rashly arrogant, when it is said: It made the earth and its inhabitants adore the beast.

Seventh, because he was the most dangerous seducer, when it is said: And it performed great signs.

Eighth, because he was the most cruel Tyrant, when it is said: Whoever would not adore the image of the beast should be killed.

In the first place, Muhammad the reprobate is described by the Blessed John as most wicked in life, when it is said: "I saw another beast," namely Muhammad, whose voluptuous life is said to be bestial, which is said to lead among animals in the first book of Ethics. For he was lustful, and inflamed by the ardor of lust, boasting among all the men of the Eastern Region of having from divine gift the generative power of more than forty men, and the power of sexual intercourse; and the bestial Muhammad also praises himself as having been granted by God the ability to lie with all women who wished to offer themselves to him freely. He is read to have had fifteen wives and two concubines; from which cause properly he is described by the Blessed John under the name of beast.

Second, the reprobate Muhammad is described by Blessed John in the proposed words as a most greedy plunderer or most avaricious one there: "Ascending from the earth"; because through trade and rapine he ascended from poverty to riches. For Muhammad, orphaned of both parents, was living under the tutelage of his uncle Manophi during the years of childhood, serving the cult of idols at that time together with the whole people of the Arabs, as he himself testifies in his Quran, saying that God said to him, referring to himself: "I found you an orphan, and took you in and cared for you; and I found you erring, and I led you." After a somewhat greater space of years he was a hired servant for the service of camels with a certain most noble widow by the name of Khadijah, and went with camels into Syria and into other places where he committed innumerable acts of brigandage and thefts. He finally won the soul of his Mistress in such a way that by right of marriage he equally dominated all things and all property. And so, promoted through cunning from ignoble and poor to rich and famous he was. And because greed, as Ambrose says, the more it ascends the more it hastens to higher things, he burst into such great pride that he promised himself the kingdom of the Arabs, unless he feared his comrades who did not hold him for a King but as equal to themselves, and even greater.

Third, Muhammad the Reprobate is described by St. John as the worst simulator of holiness, when he says that it had two horns similar to those of a Lamb, that is of Christ, whose two horns are said to be namely prophecy, according to Luke 7: "A great Prophet has arisen among us." But Muhammad, seeing that he could not come to the desired effect of kingship through violence, made use of great art and ingenuity, so that, since he could not be a King, he might counterfeit himself to be a Prophet of God and a Messenger, and pretend that a law was revealed to him by God as the highest Prophet of God. And because of this, the Blessed John the Evangelist rightly says that he

had two horns similar to the horns of the Lamb, that is Christ, because they were not such according to truth but according to human fiction. But that it was false that he was a Prophet of God, and that he received the law revealed by God, we shall demonstrate more clearly below with brighter light, the Lord assisting.

Fourth, the reprobate Muhammad is described by Blessed John as most virulent in doctrine, when he says: "*He spoke like a Dragon,*" in which plainly his deceitful and poisonous doctrine is noted. For these are the properties of the Dragon: to deceive and infuse poison secretly and fraudulently. In this way Muhammad is read to have proceeded in the deception of the Agarenes, or Ishmaelites, whom now we call Saracens.

It is narrated in a certain chronicle that a certain Cleric, very famous, when in the Roman Curia he could not obtain the honor he desired because he was unworthy, fled to the ultramontane parts, and by his simulation drew an innumerable multitude to himself. Finding Muhammad, he told him that he wished to appoint him as leader over his people, and he was placing grains of wheat and other such things in the ears of Muhammad. A dove standing on his shoulders drew food from his ears and was so accustomed to this that whenever it saw Muhammad it would presently fly to his shoulders and put its beak in his ear. The aforesaid man therefore, convoking the people, said that he wanted to appoint as their leader the one whom the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove would show, and straightaway secretly released the dove; and it flying onto the shoulders of Muhammad, while he stood with others, placed its beak in his ear. Which the people seeing believed it was the Holy Spirit descending upon him and infusing into his ears the words of God, and so Muhammad led the Saracens to receive his law as if divine, obstinately animating those who adhered to himself to invade the kingdoms of Persia and

the borders of the Eastern Empire even to Alexandria.

But elsewhere it is read that there was a certain Monk named Sergius who, falling into the error of Nestorius, when expelled from the Monks and from the Church came into Arabia and adhered to Muhammad, who taught Muhammad from the new and from the old testament many things according to the understanding of his Nestorian master, who denied that our Savior is God, and partly as it seemed good to him, and partly thoroughly imbuing him with apocryphal fables and causing the Christian Nestorian [teaching] to be so that the full plenitude of iniquity might flow together into Muhammad, and nothing might be lacking for his destruction or that of others. There were also added to him Jewish Heretics who, carefully taking precaution that no true Christian should be made — being greedy for new things, not by the virtue of scriptures but by their fables which are now abundant in Muhammad himself — mocked him. Thus, instructed by the best Jewish and heretical Doctors, Muhammad composed his Quran, and from both Jewish fables and from the venom of Heretics a wicked impious scripture woven together in his barbaric way he put together, which, given piece by piece through Gabriel — whose name he had learned from sacred scripture — he falsely claimed to have been brought to him, and infected the people ignorant of God with a lethal drink, and lining with honey the chalice for such as all these, he put to death with the subsequent deadly poison the souls and bodies of the miserable people — oh the grief! The Blessed John the Evangelist therefore rightly says that as a Dragon he spoke.

Fifth, the reprobate Muhammad is described by Blessed John as most studious in doing evil, when it is said: "*And he had the power of the first beast, exercising everything in its sight.*" According to Master Nicholas of Lyra: The manner of the first King in some Kingdom is to confirm and extend

his kingdom as much as he can, which Muhammad himself did, and therefore it is said that he had the power of the First beast over all, because whatever the first King is wont to do for confirming and extending his power, he did it more diligently in its sight — that is, as it seemed expedient to him for his purpose. Here it is noteworthy that Muhammad used four stratagems or cautions to confirm and extend his law.

The first stratagem is that his law should not be disputed by reason, but by the sword, for he feared that if it were aired among wise men, it would easily be shown to be vain and pernicious. In contrast, this is the most illustrious characteristic of the Christian Religion, in which the Prelates, not fearing this, are commanded to be ready to give a reason for the faith which is in them. For it pertains to the wise man to assign the reason and cause of his work; otherwise any fool could lay down a law and conclude whatever he wanted, and say: "*Do not believe those asserting the contrary*."

The second stratagem of which he made use is that the Saracens should not occupy themselves with studies of philosophy, through which the falsity of his law would be manifestly apparent even to those vigorous only through natural reason.

The third stratagem was that in the beginning he should persuade it only to rustics, fools, and simple people; for since in the aforesaid way he had usurped the name of Prophet, he approached men who could the more easily be deceived by any stratagem of cunning, the further they were removed from all wisdom, from the practice of civic life, and from the honesty of all human prudence — men sequestered in fields and little villages who did not know what God's messenger or Prophet should be, or how he should be known, and finally what should stand between truth and falsehood, between foolishness

and wisdom. To deceive these, fortified by the counsel and help of a certain Astrologer not mediocrely, he gathered to himself pestiferous men, waylayers, fugitives, and murderers, by whose help he increased his terror over many.

The fourth stratagem was that, relaxing the bridle of luxury and pleasure which carnally corrupt men willingly embrace, it is clear how in the extension of his sect he was most studious in doing evil.

Fifth, the reprobate Muhammad is described by the Blessed John the Evangelist as most rashly arrogant, when it is said: "*He made the earth and its inhabitants adore the first beast*," that is, himself, who proclaimed himself as such, and is believed by that foolish people of his to be the most supreme Prophet of God, and is read to have been of such great temerity that he dared to say: "*Believe in God and in his Messenger Muhammad, obey God and his Messenger, follow God and his Messenger.*" Which was indeed a most arrogant word, as we shall show below, where we shall demonstrate by manifest reason that he was not a Prophet of God, but a Pseudo-prophet.

Sixth, the reprobate Muhammad is described by Blessed John as a most dangerous seducer, when it is said: "He performed great signs, false however," so that he even caused fire to come down from heaven to earth. Here, as Master Nicholas of Lyra says, fire is taken metaphorically, as also other things that are said here. For Muhammad, after he had become very famous, began to fall into Epileptic fits, on account of which lest he be despised from this, he told his wife and the people that he suffered this from the apparition of the Archangel Gabriel, since a pure man cannot sustain his refulgence, as Daniel says in chapter 10, speaking of the Angel appearing to him: "Lord, in your vision the joints of my limbs were dissolved, and no strength remained in me." Angels moreover are called fire, according to the Psalm: "*Who makes his*

Angels spirits, and his Ministers a burning fire." But since this was false and fabricated by that wicked Muhammad, therefore it is added "in the sight of men," that is, in the false opinion of those who believed him. His disciples said that he caused the Moon, which had come down to him, to descend, which by reason of light agrees with fire; and so according to the opinion of men he caused fire to come down. And so it follows that he led astray the inhabitants of the earth through himself and his disciples on account of the signs which were said falsely about him and believed by bestial men.

Seventh, the reprobate Muhammad is described by St. John as most cruel Tyrant, when it follows: "*telling those inhabiting the earth subject to him to make an image of the beast.*" But his image — a law given by him — is said to represent his condition and life, and he commands firmly that it should be kept under penalty of death. And this is what is said: that they make an image, that is, that they fulfill his law in deed; and it was given to him — that is, permitted by God — to give spirit to the image of the beast, that is, vigor to his law. For a law is said to be living as long as it is in force, and dead when it is changed, so that the image of the beast speaks, that is, reveals its own sentence; as is said, such a law speaks in such a case, for almost everything is taken metaphorically here. It follows: "*and whoever would not adore the image of the beast*" — that is, the bestial law of Muhammad — "would not receive it and honor it, he would be killed," and he would cause by violence all the small and great, rich and poor, free and servants to have a mark on their right hand, that is in deed, and on their foreheads, by oral confession.

CHAPTER II

That Muhammad Is Shown to Be Not a True Prophet of God but a False One

ALTHOUGH from the aforesaid description — which the Blessed John described of Muhammad, with the Lord revealing — it might already be clearly apparent that Muhammad was not a true Prophet of God but false, sent by the Devil, nonetheless this same thing we shall take care to demonstrate by the most clear arguments.

First indeed, this is shown from the very filth and carnality of Muhammad's life, in which he was involved; for the gift of prophecy necessarily requires the goodness of morals, or the sanctity of mind. Hence Matthew 7, it is said in the person of the damned: "*Lord in your name we have prophesied*," and the Apostle, 1 Cor. 13: "*If I should have prophecy and know all their mysteries, but if I should not have charity, I am nothing.*" Nonetheless, the gift of prophecy is not infused into any sinners whatsoever; for some sins, as St. Thomas says, impede the use of prophecy, and some do not; because carnal sins completely withdraw the mind from spirituality. From this very fact, that anyone is subject to mortal sins, he is rendered inept for prophecy, for the revelation of which the spirituality of mind is required. Spiritual sins, however, do not so impede the spirituality of the mind, and therefore it happens that someone can be a prophet whilst subject to spiritual sins, but not to carnal ones. And therefore says Rabbi Moses ben Maimonides, the Egyptian Philosopher, as St. Thomas says that this is a sign that someone is a false Prophet, when he is detained by the pleasures of the world. [1] [2]

---

[1] *Summa Theologica II-II, Q. 172, Art. 4*
[2] *Ben Maimonides; Guide for The Perplexed, Book II, Ch. 36-40*

But since Muhammad was most involved in carnal sins — with debaucheries, lusts, adulteries beyond measure devoted — for which reason the Blessed John describes him under the name of beast, as in the present chapter, it is manifest that he was not a Prophet of God but rather from the number of those Prophets of whom Jeremiah 23 says: "*Do not hear the words of the Prophets, who prophesy to you, and deceive you, they speak the vision of their heart, and not from the mouth of the Lord.*" And Ezekiel 13: "*Thus says the Lord God, about the foolish Prophets, who follow their own spirit, and see nothing.*"

Second, the same is shown thus: for prophecy, the greatest elevation of mind to spiritual contemplation is required, which certainly is impeded not only through the vehemence of passions as in the preceding argument, but also through the inordinate occupation of exterior things. Hence it is read of the sons of the Prophets in 4 Kings that they lived with Eliseus, leading almost a solitary life, lest they be impeded from the gift of Prophecy by worldly occupations. Therefore by no means is it credible that a man leading a bestial life, always intent on misdeeds, spoliations, rapines and violences — such as was this treacherous Muhammad, as has been said — should have been endowed with the grace of Prophecy from God.

Third: Prophecy, since it is a gift of God given for the utility of the Church, just as other graces freely given — according to that of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 12: "*To each one is given the manifestation of the Spirit for utility*" — but those things which were said by Muhammad are not ordained to the utility of the faithful; indeed they are ordered to the destruction of morals, to the extermination of virtue, to the complete extirpation of faith and religion, as is manifestly apparent to those reading his Quran, and we shall show below when we shall speak about his errors. Therefore by no means is it credible that Muhammad was a Prophet of the Lord.

Fourth: Prophecy, since it is an inspiration or divine revelation announcing things to come with immovable truth, there cannot be any falsehood in prophecy that is from God. But the sect of Muhammad, which he says he had as a Prophet from God, contains many false things, many erroneous things, almost innumerable falsehoods, as is apparent to those going through his Quran, and we shall show below when we shall speak about his errors. Therefore it is impossible that Muhammad should have been a Prophet of the Lord, but rather of the Devil, who is the father of lies.

Fifth: since the knowledge of truth is the same in the Disciples and in the teaching master — because the knowledge of the one learning is a likeness of the knowledge of the one teaching, just as in natural things a generative form is a certain likeness of the generating — it is impossible that the Prophets of the Lord in their doctrines and prophetic pronouncements should mutually contradict one another. But Muhammad contradicts in many doctrines and prophetic pronouncements the other Prophets of the Lord, as is apparent and shall be more clearly apparent below, where his errors shall be spoken of. Therefore it is impossible that Muhammad should have been a Prophet of the Lord.

Sixth: Since the knowledge of truth is the same in the teaching master and the learning disciple, it is impossible for him to be a Prophet of the Lord who contradicts the law of God and the Gospel of Christ; but Muhammad taught many things contrary to the Divine law and the Gospel of Christ, as is manifest to those reading the Quran, and we shall show below. Therefore it is impossible that Muhammad himself should have been a Prophet of God.

Seventh: A prophet is said to announce unknown things; whence a Prophet is said quasi from afar proclaiming. But this man said no true things of the past, and if some things about Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Christ are read to have been narrated, I wish indeed that he had truly proclaimed them as they were with us, and not raving through many falsehoods had nearly subverted

all the truth of holy scripture. Wherefore as much as pertains to past things, he fell from the order of prophets who corrupts truth with so many falsehoods; of future things, however, because he said nothing — especially since what he says, almost nothing like it is found in all of Scripture — he is rightly excluded also, as much as pertains to the grace of future prophecy. And so what this most pernicious man had previously prophesied about the future, that his body after his death should be borne on the third day to heaven — in which he was found to have lied — it was known to all; for since on account of his word it was not immediately buried, it began to putrefy greatly, so that the magnitude of the putrefaction compelled them to bury him very quickly.

Eighth so: from that first saying of wisdom, "the spirit of discipline will flee from the fictitious;" but Muhammad was a most fictitious man, and a simulator of holiness, and a seducer of men, as has been seen in the preceding chapter. Therefore it is impossible that he should have been a Prophet of the Lord. But behold what the most foolish man answered; for he says that Moses and David were homicides, and nonetheless they are said to be Prophets of God; and so he himself, although he pursues his enemies who do not receive the law given to him by God, can be called a prophet. A false application certainly.

First, because they, if at any time they sinned, repented however, and merited forgiveness. Hence after David said, "I have sinned," the prophet Nathan said from the mouth of God: "God has transferred your sin"; but of Muhammad, that he repented of his sins, it is not read — rather it is read that he added evils to evils day by day, as is apparent from the preceding passages.

Second, because although they were at times sinners, they were not however continually subject to those sins which most greatly repugn the gift of prophecy, as was the most wicked Muhammad, as we have said above.

Third, because it is one thing for a Prophet to be bad in morals, and another thing is it to teach shameful, vile, and contrary things to the law of God, the Gospel, and the holy Prophets in prophesying or teaching. The first is possible, as we said in the beginning of this chapter; the second however is not possible in a true Prophet of God, because God cannot be a witness of falsity; and this fourth reason destroys the comparison.

Fourth, the flight of Muhammad is void, because it is false that he militates against the transgressors of the law given by God; rather he is the enemy of God and the corruptor of the Divine law, and persecutes as enemies of God those who observe the Divine law, and through his followers now persecutes them.

CHAPTER III

Certain Things Which Muhammad Falsely Claims About Himself Are Disproved

NOW it shines more clearly than light how erroneous and how foolish are those things which Muhammad asserts in praise of himself, and which the Saracens for the most part honor. Among others there are six praises of his.

The first is that he claims himself to be a general Prophet; he asserts this, and so the Saracens commend him. But that this is false is manifest, both from what was said in the preceding chapter, and secondly from that of the Gospel of Matthew 11: "Christ says: the law and the prophets until John" — from which it is known to the whole world that no general Prophet was coming further. And thirdly, hence Muhammad will be called general either because he generally prophesied about many things, but this is not so, because in the preceding chapter we have shown that he truly prophesied nothing either of the past or of the future; or he is called general because he prophesied to various peoples, but this is not so, because otherwise he would have been endowed with the gift of tongues, which however was not so, since he knew only the Arabic language, in which also the Quran is written, as he himself testifies.

The second praise that Muhammad attributed to himself is that he is the end, the seal, and the silence of all the Prophets, and he commands that the man be killed who after him claims to be a prophet. How patently, how evidently this praise is erroneous is apparent from what has been said, where by manifest arguments it has been proved that he was not a Prophet of God, but a Pseudo-prophet and seducer of souls.

The third praise which he attributes to himself is that Christ prophesied about himself, and said to the children of Israel in the Gospel: "I announce to you the Messenger of God, who will come after me, and his name is Muhammad." That this is false is apparent from the preceding things; and moreover his falsity is manifest to all reading the Gospels.

The fourth praise which the Saracens attribute to Muhammad is that his name was written on God's throne from eternity, and that Gabriel, descending, declared him as the chosen Messenger of God, whose coming had been foreordained before all creation. Yet it is foolish to believe this, for God does not speak to Angels through letters, but through the illumination of his presence, which is everywhere with them. Furthermore, if it were said to be written for men so that they might read and know it, this is not so either; for how would men read from the throne of God? Therefore what the Saracens say about the name of Muhammad remains frivolous and vain. Other arguments could be adduced against this claim — for example, of what material was the throne of God, in which they say the name of Muhammad was written from eternity, which it would then be necessary to confess as co-eternal with God himself; and with what ink was that name written from eternity in it; and similar questions — all of which clearly and by manifest light show that saying of the Saracens to be without understanding and derisory.

Moreover, how profane and foolish it is that he consequentially attributes to himself, that he should have been the one in whom all peoples were to be blessed, is manifest to that most wicked man since it cannot be suited, because the promise of blessing was made to Abraham in Isaac the son of Sarah, and of the inheritance to be obtained, and not in Ishmael the son of Hagar the handmaid, from whom descend the Ishmaelites, from whose people and race

Muhammad was. Whence those descending from him must be called Agarenes, not Saracens; whence falsely they usurped for themselves the name from Sara, as if from a free and more dignified [person]; but about Ishmael himself, Genesis 16 says that he was a wild man, and his hand against all, and the hand of all against him. Whence Muhammad is rather the one in whom and through whom almost innumerable peoples following his doctrine are cursed with the curse of damnation.

The fifth praise which Muhammad attributes to himself is that other Prophets also prophesied about him; whence he says that he is the one of whom it was said to Abraham, that in his seed all peoples would be blessed. This is certainly the most false. In the first place, where he says that the holy Prophets prophesied about him — unless, as we said above about Christ, that it was implicitly prophesied about him — when Jeremiah, speaking of pseudo-prophets, said: "Do not hear the Prophets, who prophesy to you and deceive you; they speak the vision of their own heart, and not from the mouth of the Lord." Jeremiah 23. In such things was Muhammad himself well prophesied, since among all the pseudo-prophets who have existed from the beginning of the world, he proved to be the most pernicious.

The sixth praise which Muhammad often repeats about himself is: "Believe in God and in his Messenger." A plainly blasphemous word, and a sacrilegious exhortation, as much as pertains to that part in which he says "believe in his messenger," since to believe in any person is said to denote an act of faith tending into him as into an end; and since only God is the principle and end of all things, only he alone as our leader and Lord is to be followed. Hence the Prophet Elias said in 3 Kings 18: "If the Lord is our God, follow him." Furthermore, since the worship of latria is owed to God alone, it seems that in the aforesaid words foolish Muhammad makes himself a participant and

partner of God; and yet it is held in the Quran: God does not allow if anyone gives him a participant; but only Christ, since he is true God and true man, could say that of John 9: "If you believe in God, and believe also in me, glorious," because I am God, and that of John 8: "He who follows me does not walk in darkness, but will have the light of life."

CHAPTER IV

That the Sect or Doctrine of Muhammad Handed Down in the Quran is Not a Law Given by God

HAVING settled that the reprobate Muhammad was not a true Prophet of God, but rather pseudo, false, and lying, it will be easy to prove that his sect or doctrine — which he holds captivated most many peoples — is not a law given by God, to demonstrate which we shall use those foundations which are wont to be attributed to a law which is said to be from God, as found in the sacred letters. In the first place it is written in Psalm 18: "The law of the Lord is immaculate converting souls, the testimony of the Lord is faithful giving wisdom to little ones." Where five notable conditions are attributed to a law which is from God, which since we shall show not to be present in the sect or doctrine of Muhammad, we shall understand that we have sufficiently proved that it was not given by God.

The first condition of a law which is said to be from God is that it should be reasonable, when it is said: the law. For according to the Philosopher in Ethics 2, law is that which consists in reason; and Tullius in the Philippics says: law is nothing other than right reason taken from the God of the Gods. From the condition of law it will be clear to everyone that that should not be said to be given by God which contains those things which entirely discord from reason. Hence God curses those who lay down iniquitous laws, Isaiah 10. But since the sect of Muhammad consists in no reason — for it contains many things and grants those things which discord from all right reason, indeed those which are bestial, such as fornications, adulteries, sins against nature, predations, thefts, rapines, violences, which also repugn natural reason — therefore it is manifest that that law was not given by God.

The second condition of a law which is given by God is that it prescribes honest, clean, just, and holy things, when it says: "immaculate," excluding all evils, admitting no filth of sin. Psalm: "the eloquence of the Lord is chaste eloquence," and Job 6: "there shall not be found in my mouth iniquity, nor shall foolishness personify in my jaws." For this is the condition of all good law. Which Tullius also testifies saying: the law is the right reason taken from God the Highest, imposing honest things and prohibiting contrary things. This indeed seems to be the proper effect of law, according to Aristotle in Ethics 1 and Politics 1, to lead men to their own virtue. Virtue however is that which makes the one who has it good and renders their work good; therefore it is the law's to prescribe honest and holy things. Whence about the law given by God the Apostle says in Romans 7: "the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." Since therefore the sect and doctrine of Muhammad and the Saracens is not immaculate, not honest, not holy — since it permits many vile things which are most dishonest to all who live by intellect, as is apparent from the things said above — it is manifest that the sect or doctrine of that man cannot in truth be a law given by God, who since he is the Saint of Saints, can only prescribe holy things.

But someone would perhaps say: are there not many good things that the sect of Muhammad prescribes and commands, just as for example fasting, praying, and giving alms? I answer that it is true, but from himself these first things were not invented; for Moses and Elias, and many other Prophets, and also John the Baptist, and also the Lord of all, Jesus Christ himself, fasted and prayed and showed mercy. We also, before the prodigious sect of Muhammad itself, have been taught through infinitely many times past to fast and pray and give alms; Muhammad indeed would wish to be seen as the first master of those things of which he was not worthy to be even the last disciple. Far from us a preacher of such fasting, who, after monstrous fasting, commands giving

such full attention to all lust and gluttony, that the fast is seen to have been instituted for no other reason than so that afterward all the filth of lusts might be more voluptuously and greedily excited.

The third condition of a law which is said to be from God is that it should direct not only the exterior acts of man, but also the interior ones, and convert them to God. For it is manifest that any Legislator principally intends through laws to direct men to his own end, as a Commander of an army to victory and a Rector of a City to peace. The end moreover which God intends through the law which he himself gives is God himself; therefore a law from God principally intends to ordain man to God, and so to convert souls to God, so that they might adhere to him in faith and love. From this head it appears with manifest light that the law which emanated from the Highest President — who wishes all his own to be holy and virtuous, according to that of Leviticus 11: "Be holy, because I am Holy," and 1 Thessalonians 4: "This is the will of God, your sanctification" — cannot have emanated from Muhammad, since it does not convert souls to God that they might adhere to him, but turns them away; it does not direct interior acts, nor exterior ones to virtues, not to sanctity, but to filth and the greatest brutalities.

The fourth condition of a law which is said to be from God is that it should have faithful testimony of its truth and rectitude; since as truth, which is subject to the natural faculty of the intellect, is declared and confirmed through reduction to first principles known per se, so truth which transcends the natural light of the interior — of which kind is the doctrine of the Catholic Faith (at least as to the principal articles of faith) — is declared and confirmed through miraculous works possible to God alone; when however such have been performed, to the testimony of the truth of some doctrine, its truth is declared, since God cannot be a witness of falsity. And so it was declared the

truth of the old law, because as is held in Exodus 19, in the giving of the law they heard thunderclaps flashing lightning and the densest clouds covering the earth. In this way also the law of the Gospel was confirmed before Princes and the Wise and the powerful of this world through miracles performed, both through Christ, and through his disciples, of whom John 15 Christ says: "If I had not done works in them which no other did, they would not have the sin of infidelity." Hence the Prophet foreseeing the most sufficient testimonies of the works of Christ for the truth of his doctrine, says: "your credible testimonies have been made exceedingly."

Of the disciples moreover he says in the last chapter of Mark: "They, the Disciples going forth, preached everywhere, with the Lord cooperating and confirming the word with the following signs." Where Saint Augustine says: "The earth is full of miracles, where the credulity of the faithful is educated more by acts than by utterances." From this most true foundation, it is demonstrated most clearly that the sect of Muhammad did not come from God, since it has no faithful testimony of the truth of his sect. Muhammad has not indeed any testimony of natural law, nor of any sacred Scripture, since he teaches many things contrary to the law of nature and the divine law, as we have already shown above. He does not moreover have the testimony of any miracle, since he truly performed none; indeed he himself confesses expressly that no signs were given to him except those which are common to tyrants and robbers, namely the violence of arms. Hence he says: "***I am not sent except in the power of the sword, and he who has not received my prophecy should be killed, or pay a tribute of money for his infidelity, and be let go.***" [3]From which words it is most clearly received as an argument that all those things are false and fabricated lies which the Saracens feign about his miracles, since Muhammad himself expressly confesses that no signs were given to him,

[3] *Musnad of Ahman 5114*

except those which are common to tyrants and robbers, namely the violence of arms.

The fifth condition of a law which is said to be from God is that it should be wisdom-bestowing to little ones, that is to peoples. Hence about the divine law it is said in Deuteronomy 4: "*This is your wisdom and understanding before the peoples.*" For wisdom of doctrine, as is said in Ecclesiasticus 6, is according to its name; and it is called wisdom, quasi "sapid knowledge," because it perfuses the mind with the delight and sweetness of celestial and divine things. Hence the most serene light is called celestial wisdom, because it illuminates the intellect with its splendor and inebriates the effect with mellifluous love. Whence in the Psalm: "*How sweet are your utterances to my mouth, above honey to my mouth.*" But since they are not suited to the law of Muhammad, which is full of the fetters of carnality and luxury, it is manifestly apparent that it did not come from God, but from the devil.

The sixth condition of a law which is said to be from God is that it should contain truth in all things and teach it. Whence Psalm 118: "*all your commandments are truth*"; item, "the beginning of your words is truth." Proverbs 8: the divine wisdom says, "*all the words of my mouth are justice; there is nothing depraved nor perverse in them.*" But the sect of Muhammad contains many falsehoods, and the most pernicious and worst errors, some of which we shall commemorate below in refuting them. Whence it appears with the most open light that the law of Muhammad did not proceed from God. We have said moreover notably: it is proper of a law which is from God to be true in all things, because to contain some good things, or true things mixed with evils, is also suited to the devil's and Heretics' doctrines. Thus it happens in the sect of Muhammad, for there many true things are inserted — such as about the unity of God, about the one God to be worshipped — and good

things mixed with evils, such as about the giving of alms, and sometimes fasting and such things; which is the cause of deceiving, so that false things on account of true ones might be believed, and so that evils might be received on account of good ones. This is the cunning of Heretics, as Isidore says, so that false things mixing with true ones and evil ones with good ones, they might more easily persuade the perversity of a depraved dogma under the appearance of virtue.

The seventh condition of a law which is said to be from God is that it should contain serious and solid things, not fables. Hence the Prophet in Psalm 118 says: "*They narrated to me iniquitous fables, because heresies and sects contain many fabulous and fictitious things.*" Whence it follows: but not as your law, "*all your commandments are truth, not falsities, not vanities.*" But since the law of Muhammad is full of deriding fables, as is manifestly apparent to those reading his Quran, it is manifest that it was not given by God, but rather is believed to have been given by the devil, or conflated by him inspiring it. Hence it is believed that the enemy of the human race and adversary of the Christian Faith, the devil, seeing that the Faith of Christ was growing in the parts of the East and that Idolatry was deficient — now with the Idolater King Cosdra of the Persians and Medes being defeated by the Emperor Heraclius — and not being able any longer to defend the many Gods, nor totally deny the law of Moses and the Gospel of Christ, which had already been divulged through the world, he devised through a certain deception of a law intermediate between the new and the old to deceive the world; and for executing this, he assumed Muhammad, a maleficent man, reared in the rite of Idolaters, poor in fortune, most proud of mind. And certainly the devil would more willingly have assumed a man of good reputation if it had been permitted to him, but divine Wisdom did not permit except that such an animal should assume and through such a man should invade the world, so

that the world could easily discern what kind of law was given through such a Legislator. And since Muhammad was an idiot and without letters, the devil gave him companions suited to himself, as we partly said above, namely certain Jewish heretics, and certain Christians called Jacobites and Nestorian heretics, who most greatly agree with the Saracens in saying that God was not born of the Blessed Virgin, but instead that Jesus Christ was a mere man; and thus that sect, the devil inspiring, was conflated.

The eighth condition of a law emanating from God is that it should be entirely consonant with itself, and repugnant to itself in nothing. Hence about the divine law it is said in the Psalm: "A lamp to my feet is your word, and a light to my paths"; where it is said by the gloss that by lamp is understood the old testament, by light, the new. Proverbs 6: "*The commandment is a lamp, and the law is a light*"; and this, therefore, among other things, because all its parts are consonant, not having anything of contrariety mixed in. But this the law or sect of Muhammad does not have, it is manifest since it contains many contradictions in itself, of which we shall recall some. For he says in many places that God does not provide guidance to the one who prays, and yet he exhorts to pray to God that they might be directed, and led from darkness to light, and onto a straight path.

He says about himself that he was deprived of both parents and an Idolater, and yet he says that when God made him such a Prophet and God went for him, he ascended even to the seventh heaven and obtained pardon from a certain Angel who was greater than the whole world a thousand times, whom he found weeping for his sins.

He says he is a general Prophet, and yet says that the Quran was given to him in Arabic, and that he does not know another language except Arabic. He says in the Chapter of the Cow (which is interpreted as cow), that Jews and

Christians and Sabeans will be saved [4], and afterward elsewhere says that no one is saved except in the law of the Saracens. He says that Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and their sons were Saracens; yet he himself says that the commandment given to him by God is that he himself should be the first Saracen; and many other things are read in which he contradicts himself, with which it wearies our pen to deal.

The ninth condition of a law which is said to have proceeded from God is that it should be possible. Hence in the definition of law this is put, that it should be possible; since as Blessed Isidore says, law is honest, just, possible, and it is understood as possible not only as much as pertains to precepts, which should always be proportioned to those to whom they are imposed — as the Philosopher teaches in Politics 4 — but also as much as pertains to those things which it narrates as true foundations of law. [5] These things of Muhammad in no way suit; for he narrates at times about himself, and about the Angels, and about God for the confirmation of his sect, things which are so impossible in themselves that no man who has any intellect and sense can believe that they thus happened. Among other things Muhammad, expounding the Chapter of the Quran which is said to be of the children of Israel — in which it is said, "***praise be to him who transported his servant under one night from the Oratory of Helcharata, which is the house of Mecca, all the way to the most remote Oratory, which is the holy house in Jerusalem, about which we apprehend God***" — said thus: "***O men, understand; late, after you left me, Gabriel came to me after the last evening psalm, and said to me: O Muhammad, God commands you to visit him, and I said: where, and where shall I visit him? And Gabriel said: in the place where he himself is; and he brought to me a beast greater than a Donkey and less than a mule, and its name is Elberahil, which spoke, and in one hour, a space and journey of***

[4] *Al-Baqarah 2:62*
[5] *Saint Isidore of Seville; Etymologies VII*

fifty thousand years; and Gabriel said to me: ascend this, and ride up all the way to the holy house. When I tried to ascend the beast, it refused to allow me to ascend unless first I prayed to God for it. But I interceded before the Lord my master; I mounted the beast, and was walking insistently forward supporting me, and it was placing the nail of its foot on the horizon of its vision. And so I came to the holy house in a shorter time than the blink of an eye, and Gabriel was with me, and he led me to the rock, to the holy house in Jerusalem, and Gabriel said: descend, because from the rock you will ascend into heaven. And I descended, and Gabriel bound the animal in a circle at the rock, and carried me on his shoulders all the way to heaven. And when I had come to the sky of the world, Gabriel knocked at the door, and it was said to him: who are you? He answered: I am Gabriel; and it was said to him again: and who is with you there? He answered, Muhammad; and the Doorkeeper said: was it sent for him? Gabriel answered: yes, and he opened the door for us; and I saw a people from the Angels, and bowing the knees for them twice I poured out a prayer; afterward Gabriel accepted me, and led me to the second heaven, and the distance between one heaven and another was the journey of five hundred years; and as in the first heaven he said he had knocked, so through all he did up to the seventh heaven. In which seventh heaven he writes that he saw the multitude of the people of the Angels, and the length of each Angel was many thousand times the size of the world, some of which had seven hundred thousand heads, and in each head seven hundred million mouths, and in each mouth seven hundred million tongues praising God in seven hundred thousand millions of idioms; and he saw one Angel weeping, and he asked the cause of his weeping; he answered, his sins were to blame; and he himself prayed for him; Gabriel commended me to another Angel, and he to another, and so until I stood before God and before his tribunal, and he touched me between the shoulders with his hand, so that the coldness of his hand penetrated all

the way to the marrows of my back." And many other vain and foolish ravings of this kind he says, with which it wearies us to elaborate."[6]

Plainly this sole fiction of the vision now narrated, full of so many impossibilities, so many ravings and foolishnesses, suffices to show that Muhammad was not a Prophet of the Lord, but rather a pernicious enchanter, a seducer of peoples, a minister of the devil, and a precursor of Antichrist. It also suffices to show that his sect did not come from God but from the devil, who is the father of lies and errors. Having weighed all these things well, we cannot sufficiently wonder how it could be persuaded — I say not to some wise man, but even to any person who considers anything of human heart — that Muhammad was a Prophet, whose life and doctrine are so contrary not only to divine Religion but even to human honesty, that even brute animals could almost understand this. But that we might again say something milder: who among the Saints and divine messengers, those whom we have known as sent by God, claimed himself to be sent in the terror of the sword? Who lived so viciously? Who taught so many filths? Or who thus prostituted the human race to the belly and to lust?

[6] *Sahih Al-Bukhari 349, Sahih Muslim 163*

CHAPTER V

On the Principles or Foundations to Be Used in the Refutation of the Errors of Muhammad

SINCE disputants and contenders necessarily need to agree on some common principles — from which, as from irrefragable testimonies, the proceeding to the elucidation of truth and to the disapprobation of falsity should take place — we who are about to fight against the most false man Muhammad must use the principles and foundations which this enemy himself does not deny, does not spurn, but accepts, praises, and commends. The law of Moses I say, and the Prophets, and especially the Gospel of Christ, which he commends above all things, and is accustomed to use for the proof of his sect; although Muhammad with the heretical Nestorians denies Christ to be God, nevertheless he greatly commends him for sanctity and the power of miracles, whence in Chapter 6 of the Quran he thus speaks about Christ to his Mary: "***O Mary, to you is the joy of the highest Messenger with the word of God, whose name is Christ Jesus, who is the face of all peoples in this world and the future, present, wise, a good man, and the best is sent from the Creator of the universe.***" She answered: "***O God, how shall I conceive a son, since I have not touched a man?***" The Angels answer: "***God finds nothing impossible, all things operate as he wills, and your son with divine virtue coming will learn the book and all the mastery of the testament, and the Gospel, and will teach the sons of Israel, and will cure the blind, and the dumb, and will raise the dead, and will heal the leprous.***" [7] And then in Chapter 5, he says God says to the Jews: "***Then in the footsteps of the prophets, We sent Jesus, son of Mary, confirming the Torah revealed before him. And We gave him the Gospel containing guidance and light and confirming what was revealed in the Torah—a guide and a lesson to the***

[7] *Ali 'Imran 3:45*

God-fearing." [8]Furthermore, all the books of the Apostles who were personally present with Christ, the Saracens receive; the books however of others they reject as forgers. Therefore we shall take first for the destruction of the errors of Muhammad those foundations by him praised and commended, namely the law of God, the Prophets, the doctrine of the Saints, and the Gospel of Christ. We shall moreover use in the second place in our argumentation against the adversary, as in diabolical disputes and contentious litigations it sometimes happens that some things conceded by him are recognized as more greatly favoring our intention or as supporting; for in this way, as St. Thomas says in Summa Contra Gentiles.[9] The ancient Doctors used in the destruction of the errors of the Gentiles, those whom they were able to know.

[8] *Al-Ma'idah 5:46*
[9] *Summa Contra Gentiles Book I, Ch. 2*

CHAPTER VI

The Principal Errors of Muhammad to Be Refuted Are Described

SINCE then, with divine power aiding us with the zeal of Catholic truth, we intend to drive away and destroy the errors of the most condemned Muhammad, we shall describe in the first place those which are principal and most openly opposed to the truth of the Catholic Faith, against which we shall most fittingly turn the point of our mind armed with divine letters. For the sake of brevity we shall bring them back to the number of forty:

1. The first error is that he denies the trinity of divine persons.

2. The second is that he denies the divine generation.

3. The third is that he denies the Holy Spirit is God.

4. The fourth is that he denies the mystery of the Incarnation.

5. The fifth is that he denies that Christ is God.

6. The sixth is that he denies that Christ was dead.

7. The seventh is that he denies that Christ will judge on the Day of Judgment.

8. The eighth is that he asserts that the Jews corrupted the law and the Prophets, and that the Christians did the same, so that nothing remained of the truth of the law, the Prophets, and the Gospel, except what is contained in the Quran.

9. The ninth is that God is corporeal, attributing to him corporeal members, namely hands, feet, and such like.

10. The tenth is that God is the cause of all sins.

11. Error eleven, that it seems to assert that all worldly things are fortuitous.

12. Error twelve, that he asserts Circumcision is to be preserved.

13. Error thirteen is that he reproaches Christians with the adoration of images.

14. Error fourteen is that he imputes to Christians that they adore their own Priests.

15. Error fifteen is that anyone who lives rightly in his own sect can be saved.

16. Error sixteen, that no one will be saved except in the sect of the Saracens.

17. Error seventeen, that Angels are corporeal, made from flame of fire or born.

18. Error eighteen, that Angels are to be killed, and they will finally rise at the Day of Judgment with others.

19. Error nineteen, that he asserts that the blessed Angels sin.

20. Error twenty, that the demons will be saved, according to the Quran.

21. Error twenty-one, that he says that God commanded the Angels that they should adore the first man.

22. Error twenty-two, that Angels were ignorant of the natures and names of things which Adam assigned to things.

23. Error twenty-three, that he said the soul of Adam is from a portion of the soul of God.

24. Error twenty-four, that he says all men are produced from one soul.

25. Error twenty-five, that he says that heaven was produced from smoke, which rises from the vapor of the sea.

26. Error twenty-six, that the Sun and Moon were made of equal light and virtue, but the wing of Gabriel touching the Moon obscured it.

27. Error twenty-seven, that it is permitted to have many wives.

28. Error twenty-eight is that it is permitted to repudiate one's wife.

29. Error twenty-nine, that he permitted, as licit, adultery and fornication.

30. Error thirty, that he permitted, as licit, sin against nature.

31. Error thirty-one, that after resurrection there will be the use of foods and sexual intercourse.

32. Error thirty-two, that he placed future happiness in carnal pleasures.

33. Error thirty-three, that drinking wine is the greatest sin.

34. Error thirty-four, that all created things invoke and adore God.

35. Error thirty-five, that the Blessed Virgin, having received the greeting of the Angel and conceived a son, fled to a distant place where there were palms, and there gave birth.

36. Error thirty-six, that when the Blessed Virgin was carrying the son in her arms, she was rebuked by neighbors for the sin of adultery.

37. Error thirty-seven, that the Prophets and Apostles were Saracens.

38. Error thirty-eight, that he imposes many false and lying things on God.

CHAPTER VII

On the First Error of Muhammad and Its Refutation

THE treacherous Muhammad, not able to understand the plurality of divine persons with the unity of the Divine Essence, denies the Trinity of persons in the Divine, in this following the treacherous heretic Sabellius, who, positing one essence, denied the Trinity of persons, saying that one person is sometimes called Father, sometimes Son, sometimes Holy Spirit. Hence in his Quran he mocks the Christians asserting three persons in the Divine, as if by this Christians believe in three Gods and adore them — which is however most false, since the holy Christian Religion does not sense concerning the Trinity of Divine Persons in this way, but [holds] the Holy Trinity, namely Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, one Almighty God, of one substance or essence, of one power, creator and rector of all creatures, from whom are all things, through whom are all things, in whom are all things — this it believes and confesses. And because of this it is so, because the unity of the Divine Essence repugnates in nothing to the plurality of persons, and the cause of this the holy Doctors assign: because relation, and especially the relation of origin by which one proceeds from another, predicates nothing of the other except that it is from it, and because of this divides nothing, as Anselm says, unless for that to which it posits opposition; and it posits no opposition to Essence in Essence. Therefore it makes no division, and therefore it follows, as also Boethius says, that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, and these three are one God, because the unity of essence is of them, and the unity remains in them, since in nothing it is divided nor can it be divided. Hence because Arius and Sabellius did not understand, Muhammad and his followers denied the plurality of persons in the Divine.

In order to refute and disapprove this error, we shall use first the testimonies from the sources of the sacred letters, where the very highest and uncreated

Trinity of divine persons, together with the Nature or unity of essence, is most clearly demonstrated.

In the first place occurs that of Genesis 1: "*In the beginning God created heaven and earth*," where divine Scripture by God signifies the Father; by beginning, the Son, for which reason with us — with the Hebrew Truth — it is said God has Eloy (אלהים), which is the plural of this singular El, which signifies therefore not El (אֵל), which is God, but Eloy, which can be interpreted as Gods or Judges in reference to the plurality of persons; but by the word "created," which is added singular, it indicates the unity of essence; and so with the unity of essence the plurality of persons in the Divine is insinuated.

Second, the same is this very sacred scripture, Genesis 2, saying: "*Let us make man in our image and likeness.*" For it says plurally: "*Let **us** make, and **our***," showing the plurality of persons; but speaking by word singular "*in image*," the unity of essence is demonstrated; as also Saint Augustine says in faith to Peter: "*If in the nature of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit it were one person only, it would not be said: Let us make.*" [10] Since he says "*in our image*," he shows that the same God is not one but multiple persons; and it cannot be said with truth that that word of God was to the Angels, because first, Angels were not creators of souls; then second, because man is said to be made not in the image of an Angel, but of God, whence immediately thereafter it is subjoined: "*in the image of God he created him.*" It is therefore the word of the Father to the Son, or of the whole Trinity to each other. For God, who is one in essence, is Trinity in persons. A similar argument can be taken from the words of Muhammad in the Quran, where he often says in the person of God in the plural: "*Let us create heaven and earth. Let us justify man.*" Such plainly plural discourse indicates the plurality of persons in the divine, attending to the fact that, as a little before we said, it could not be

[10] *Saint Augustine; De Fide ad Petrum Book 1*

speech to the Angels, since in the work of creation or of justification the Angels do not cooperate with God.

Third, the error of Muhammad is plainly confounded by what sacred Scripture reports about Abraham, Genesis 18: that he saw three and adored one. Where Blessed Abraham manifestly confesses the mystery of the Trinity of divine persons in the unity of essence, for unless he understood God there, he would not adore God, which belongs to God alone; and unless he understood not one but several persons, he would not adore three. When therefore, seeing three, he adored one in the figure of three Youths, he understood one God in Trinity to be adored.

Fourth, the error of Muhammad is confounded from that of Isaiah the Prophet, chapter 6, where the Seraphim are said to have cried: "*Holy Holy Holy Lord God Sabaoth*"; where by the triple Holy the Trinity of persons is signified. But in that he says once Lord God Sabaoth, the unity of the Divine Essence is acknowledged, as Augustine argues in the book of faith and the Trinity.

Fifth, the aforesaid error of Muhammad is rebutted through the outstanding prophet David, who in many places of the Psalms insinuates the Trinity of Divine persons. Hence Psalm 32 says: "*By the word of the Lord the heavens are confirmed, and by the spirit of his mouth all their power*"; where manifestly is expressed the plurality of Divine persons with the unity of essence; since it is known to the Wise that the word is really distinguished from the speaker or enunciator, and similarly the spirit from the inspirator; and yet these three are one, whose unity the Prophet straightway insinuates saying: "*Congregating as in a vessel the waters of the sea.*" So therefore in the person of the Lord Father we accept, in the word the Son we believe, in the Spirit of his mouth we understand the Holy Spirit in truth.

Sixth, the aforesaid error of Muhammad is disapproved from Psalm 66, where the Royal Prophet says: "*May God bless us, our God, may God bless us, and*

may all the ends of the earth fear him." The triple confession of God expresses the Trinity of persons. The unity of essence moreover he opens, when singularly he subjoins: "may all the ends of the earth fear him."

Seventh, the aforesaid error of Muhammad is most clearly disapproved from the Gospel of Luke which he himself commends. Hence the Lord speaking to the Apostle says in Matt. last: "*Go, teach all peoples, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.*" By name — as Ambrose says in the book of the Trinity — not by names, so that the unity of essence might be shown, and by the three names the three persons were declared; and he declared this.

Eighth, the aforesaid error of Muhammad is confounded from that of John 10, where Christ says: "*I and the Father are one,*" as Ambrose says, lest there be made a distinction of power and nature and he added "*we are*," so that you might know the Father as Son.

Ninth, the error is manifestly eliminated by the testimony of the Most Blessed John the Evangelist, who in his first Chronicle, 1 John 5, says: "*There are three who give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.*"

Tenth, the aforesaid error is confounded by the testimony of the Most Blessed Paul, who most evidently commends the Trinity of persons and the unity of essence, saying: "*Because from him and through him and in him are all things.*" From him, as Saint Augustine says in the book on the Trinity of God, is on account of the Father; through him, on account of the Son; in him, on account of the Holy Spirit. Behold how, as Saint Augustine says, all scripture of the old and new testament divinely inspired, if it is understood catholically, insinuates this: that Father and Son and Holy Spirit are one God of the same substance of one essence, and inseparable unity of divinity. The great evil certainly of blindness that Muhammad seems to have had, who, from so many

splendors of sacred scriptures lauded and accepted by him, so clearly insinuating the ineffable unity, and the Trinity, presumed to deny them.

CHAPTER VIII

The Second Error of Muhammad Is Refuted

FURTHERMORE, the bestial Muhammad, since he knows no generation except carnal one through the mixture of male and female, denies generation in the divine. In this following Arrius, who, saying the Son of God is a creature, manifestly denied generation, which is the work of nature in the divine. Whom Muhammad following says that God cannot have a Son; to confirm which error he adduces two foolish arguments. The first is that God does not have a wife. The second is that if he had a Son, the whole world would be in peril because there would be a schism between them. Against this error, fighting, first we think it should be noted and exhorted that whoever hears the Christian Faith asserting generation in the divine and that God has a Son, does not conceive so great an outrage as to think that God, existing as the sole eternal, could commix himself with anything? &c. Or, with such power that he could do anything he willed, in order to produce a Son of another could he have had no need of the society of another? In order to refute this error of Muhammad and others whom he imitates, denying generation to be in the divine, we shall proceed.

First through some convenient reasons and probability-making arguments for our faith. Second, more efficaciously, through the most open testimonies of the sacred letters. First by reason, it is plainly evident: when generation is a communication of nature, it most greatly suits that which is the greatest communicability. The greatest good, however, which is God, is the greatest communicability of himself. Therefore generation greatly suits him. Hence the greatest Dionysius among the Greeks, in the book on the Divine Names, chapter 4: That from the causes of love the highest does not exist without its own germ; to generate however is to germinate. And if someone should perhaps contradict this, that this generates in the divine in diversity of

substance and nature, as Arrius understood, according to that of Genesis 2: "And these are the generations of heaven and earth" — this is nothing, because from the fact that generation is the communication of diffusible nature, and this is the act of the good itself, since Plato says: "It is of the good to bring about good things, and of the best the best" — it consequently follows: what is best naturally generates; which is God, who does not make another unlike himself except through generation; therefore generation convenes to God. What Dionysius calls the Son and Holy Spirit are divine flowers and divine lights. Hence also Boethius says that nature is the power inherent in things producing similar from similar; therefore idem which previously, namely that generation is in the divine. Moreover third so the Philosopher says: each perfect thing is able to make another like itself; if therefore this is the act and sign of the perfect, it is attributed to the utterly supreme and most perfect; most greatly it is that God does not make another like himself except through generation; therefore generation convenes to God.

For the understanding of what kind is the generation which is believed by Christians to be in the divine, first it is to be considered, as we have already said in part: it is ridiculous the ridicule with which Muhammad and likewise the Saracens or Turks mock the Christians, saying that God the Father has a Son, as if God had a wife. Since they are carnal, they can think only of what is of flesh and blood. Therefore it is known to every Wise man that the mode of generation is not the same in all things, but in each thing generation is found according to the property of its nature. In some animals indeed through the mixture of male and female. In plants however through germination or through budding. In luminous bodies through diffusion — as we see that the light in a luminous body, which is the Sun, generates globes of light and rays, of which each globe is as great as the Sun which generates it from itself without its own diminution and mutation, and is formally of the same essence and light with the Sun — and in other things otherwise. God however is not of

carnal nature so as to need a female to be mixed with for the generation of offspring, but he is of spiritual and intellectual nature; more so, God is beyond all intellect. Therefore in God generation is to be accepted according to what is suited to intellectual nature.

And according to our intellect which falls short of the divine intellect, we cannot otherwise speak of the divine intellect except according to the likeness of those things which we find by our intellect. But there is in our intellect sometimes in potency, sometimes in act; and when it understands actually, it forms a certain intelligible thing, which is as it were a progeny of itself, whence as a vocal word signifying the concept of the mind is called a word exteriorly, so this interior concept of the mind signified by the exterior word is called the word of the mind. This concept of our mind is not the very substance of our mind or essence, but is a certain accident of it; nor is our very understanding it the very being of our intellect, otherwise the intellect would always be in potency since it always understands. The Word therefore of our intellect is said by a certain likeness to be able to be called a concept or progeny, and especially when our intellect understands itself, insomuch as it is a certain likeness of the intellect proceeding from its intellectual virtue, just as a son has the likeness of his father insomuch as he is proceeding from his generative virtue; not however properly our word or the progeny of our intellect can be called a son, because it is not of the same nature as our intellect, nor is it that all that proceeds from another even if it is similar to it is called a son, otherwise an image of itself which someone paints would properly be called a son, which is not true; but for this, that a son should be made, it is required that the one proceeding from another should have the likeness of it and be subsisting in the same nature with it.

And since this is found in our word only by way of likeness, we name the concept of the divine intellect by human words of human custom as Son of God, and we name God whose word it is Father; and the procession itself we

say is generation of a son. Whence Anselm says in the Monologium that the supreme essence understanding herself says herself, is Father to generate, and the Son to be generated. And Augustine similarly says in the sermon on Genesis that God to say the word is the Father himself to generate, and the Son is the good word, that is from the fullness of mine, and secret essence I begot a word which is good, which is called the word, because through it the Father is known. The word is called good because the Son of God is good in nature, thus he alone is good with the Father and the Holy Spirit. Hence no one is good except God alone, this is the good word because through it all good things were made. Furthermore the same is testified by the Wise man, Ecclesiasticus 24, where from the person of divine Wisdom born, that is the word of God or the Son of God, he says: "I came forth from the mouth of the Most High, the firstborn before every creature." The Most Blessed John the Evangelist in a similar way explains this declared manner of generation, saying: "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and God was the word; and this was in the beginning with God." In which words the Blessed Evangelist manifestly and most lucidly intimates to us the said mode of generation. In the first place he explains the eternal generation of the Son by the Father, when he says "in the beginning," that is in God who is profited as the first principle of all things. "Was the word" as we said above, proceeding in likeness of the same nature. Secondly, he notes the personal distinction there: "and the word was with God." Third, the co-substantiality of the Father and the Son is shown there: "and God was the word," and this was in the beginning with God, that is co-eternal with God himself, and so as Augustine says in the sermon on John, chapter 20: nothing is lacking to the generating because neither time sought that it might generate, nor mother sought, that it might generate, who brought forth eternally; nor did the generating Father precede the Son as older, in order that he might generate a younger Son from himself.

From all which things we think we have shown sufficiently the kind of generation that is to be sought, which the notable and most sapient Christian Religion asserts in God not material indeed and corporeal as the bestial Muhammad was arguing, but formal and intellectual in the mode now explained. Whence he was able and gave the paternum intellect and the form extracted from itself — as Augustine says, the Architect full of the reasons of all living things delucidata — now of the series of divine generation as we could, who about such an excellent thing cannot have words as Gregory says, but as we can we stammer, and in divine things we resonate; and Dionysius in the book on D. N. chapter 1, says: When we come to the Divine we find perfect irrationality, that is ineffability. And Ambrose: I am not able to sustain the secret of generation, the voice is not mine only but also of the Angels. Hence Isaiah 53: his generation who will narrate? as if saying, no one; consequently now it is of the fuller disapprobation of the aforesaid error of the treacherous Muhammad to adduce some testimonies of the sacred Scriptures, which Muhammad himself commends and accepts, although from the aforesaid things he seems to be sufficiently reproved. For the Prophet David says, speaking about God and Christ, Psalm 2: "The kings of the earth were present, namely Herod who is called the King of Galilee, Mark 6, and Pontius Pilate who held the position of the Emperor at that time, and the Princes namely the Priests Annas, Caiphas convened in one, that is in one will of killing Christ, against the Lord, namely against God the Father, for whoever contradicts the Son contradicts the Father too"; and below in the person of Christ it is added: "The Lord said to me: you are my Son, I today have begotten you." "I today," that is in eternity, that is nothing passes in the past nor is expected in the future. Therefore the eternal generation of the Son by the Father is conveniently expressed through the present tense, through which clearly manifest things are proven to be generation in the divine, both because of no other it can be verified except of the Son of God whom the Father

naturally and eternally begot, and because the Apostle Paul, writing to the Hebrews, used this authority at the letter to prove Christ the natural Son of God.

Second, the same is shown from Psalm 109, where from the person of the Father speech is to the Son: "With you is the principium." That is, I am and you are one principle of all things, which here is not seen, but is seen in the day of your power, that is in eternity which is the day without night, where the Divine virtue is contemplated not by all, but by the Saints when in the Resurrection they will be splendid like the Angels of God. Hence it follows: "In the splendors of the Saints, from the womb, from the occult and secret substance of mine I begot you ineffably, before any creature and before all times." From which authority most lucidly the faith of the Catholic Faith shines and the error of Muhammad is confounded.

Third, to the same is that of Proverbs 8, where from the person of divine Wisdom born, that is the Word of God or the Son of God, it is explicitly explained the eternal generation of the Son of God, who as the Apostle Paul says is the virtue of God and the wisdom of God.

Fourth, to the same is that of Proverbs 3, where something is said about the New Knowledge of the Saints, and it follows straightway: "Who ascended into heaven and descended? Who contains the Spirit in his hands? who collected waters as in a vestment? who raised all the ends of the earth: what is his name, and what is the name of his son, if you know?" Where manifestly of the eternal generation is spoken, since of no one except of God can the things be verified in this authority; and it is to be attended that God descends and ascends is said, Transcending the power and descending in the earth and having the cognition of all lower and superior things, disposing from end to end all things sweetly according to the wisdom of Wisdom 8.

Fifth, the error is confounded from that of Isaiah 66: "If I who give generation to all tribes will be sterile, says the Lord God," as if he were saying no. Sixth, the same is collected from the Gospel: for John 8: "Blessed Christ, I came forth from God and came into the world, nor did I come from myself." Where first the procession from the Father is noted, eternal in which the Son is the co-equal of the Father; secondly is noted the advent of him into flesh, in which as man made with men he was humbly conversed. Many other testimonies against this error we pass over for the sake of brevity, and because these which have been adduced most powerfully militate against it. From which most clearly it appears how foolish are the arguments adduced by Muhammad against the generation of the Son of God. First, indeed when he was saying that God did not have a Son because he did not have a wife; it is foolish, as we showed in the beginning of the chapter that God is not of carnal nature that it would need a female, to be mixed with whom for the generation of offspring. For this kind of origin has the condition of caduc mortals. Christ indeed from the Father so shone as the splendor from the light, as the word from the mouth, and wisdom from the heart, as the Most Blessed Ambrose says; and we have shown above according to what has been said: secondly, when he says that if God had a Son the whole world would be in peril etc. Plainly as a madman speaking he supposes a most false thing, namely that God cannot have a Son unless a bad and contumacious and disobedient one, Profectly since we have shown above that the Son of God is the word of God, through which all things operate, and the conceived word never differs from the conceiving intellect, manifestly in this he as a beast, void of all reason, spoke foolishly Muhammad the stupid, unless in blasphemy he would say that God discords from himself in his intellect, and that his conception contradicts to him; God however always and wholly immutable remains. Hence Psalm: "You however are the same," that is always. Because as Augustine says: God

alone is immutable, who can neither in place, nor through affection, nor through time be changed.

CHAPTER IX

The Third Error of Muhammad Is Refuted

THE treacherous Muhammad, just as he denies generation in the divine, so also denies the procession of the Holy Spirit. In this following Arrius and Nestorius as Heretics, and Macedonius, who said that the Holy Spirit was not God proceeding eternally from the Father and Son but a creature. Against this error we shall proceed as in the preceding. We shall adduce first some reasons convenient to this. Second, we shall adduce testimonies of the sacred Scriptures which Muhammad commends, by which both the truth of faith is approved and the said error is refuted wholly.

First, against the aforesaid error we can argue thus: as from the highest good it cannot be the diffusion of nature through generation, as was proved in the preceding chapter, so there cannot be lacking to the sweetness of the highest good the diffusion of the highest good through the will, because otherwise there would not seem in it to be the greatest delight, but the intimate and sweetest diffusion through love is love, which therefore is diffused from the highest good; but that which from God proceeds, remaining in God, is God, and because it has from another the proper mode of subsisting, it has a proper subsisting mode, which is called from it which it is from another existing, and so the Holy Spirit proceeds and its procession is its own. Second so, every good in God is in the highest and of the highest affection, so that of the highest good the supreme diffusion of the highest good through love will exist, because through love diffusing it from the highest good produces equal to itself, because otherwise it would not be the highest — therefore it produces love, which from this that it is from another, has the proper mode of existing; but what produces not through generation is not a son, such therefore this love so proceeding from the lover and distinct is a personal propriety and God is, and Pater non est, nec filius, sed utrique aequalis, and such a procession we

call the procession of the Holy Spirit. Third so it is established that the highest good is the greatest magnificent or as more properly we speak magnificent. For the Philosopher says in Ethics 4: it is of the generous and magnificent to love and in delight: to give is necessary therefore that before every gift which gives love and delight preceding from itself, because otherwise not commendably magnificent and generous they would be, nor their magnificence and generosity according to the best mode, because the love and delight preceding from love, going before any gift that gives, must precede. Hence Augustine says: love is the gift from which all other gifts are given, but that it proceeds from another has the singular mode of existing, and because it is in God and is God and is not the Father, nor the Son, the procession of the Holy Spirit. The divine love proceeding from the nature, in us love proceeds doubly from cause, sometimes indeed from corporeal and material nature, who frequently is impure love, because through it the purity of mind is disturbed; sometimes however from the property of spiritual nature of the spirit, as when we love intelligible goods, and those suited to reason, and here is pure love: in God however corporeal and material love has no place. Conveniently therefore the love of God himself not only Spirit but Holy we call, so that through this the purity might be expressed. It is manifest moreover that nothing of the intelligible love we can, and of the holy love except what we conceive by the act of the intellect. Conception of the intellect moreover as we said in the preceding chapter is the word, whence it is necessary that love hears from the word. But we have said the word of God to be the Son; therefore from the Son the Holy Spirit, and so it is from the Father and the Son, and this equally, and Deus est subsistens in natura divina, and Father is not, nor Son, but equal to both, and this we confess to be the Holy Spirit. From which all these things it is collected that when all things subsist in the intellectual nature, a person with us is called; with the Greeks moreover hypostasis it is necessary to say, that the word of God, which we name Son of

God, is a certain hypostasis or person, and the same is to be said of the Holy Spirit. To no one therefore is there a doubt that God, from whom the word and the love proceed, are things subsisting, so that the word of God, which we name Son of God, is a certain hypostasis or person; and God whose word it is we name Father; and the procession of the same we say is generation of a son. So therefore it should be confessed about the Holy Spirit: and so conveniently in the Divine we place three persons, namely the person of the Father, the person of the Son, and the person of the Holy Spirit. These persons however we do not say to be diverse by essence, but by sole distinct relations, which come from the procession of the Word and of love; and so the Christian Religion confessing three distinct persons in the Divine does not believe or says three Gods, as the treacherous Muhammad opined, but the Father and Son and Holy Spirit naturally one God, not however the Father himself who is the Son, nor the Son who is the Father, nor the Holy Spirit who is the Father or who is the Son. One is the essence of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, in which there is nothing different of the Father, something different of the Son, something different of the Holy Spirit. Although personally the Father is different, the Son is different, the Holy Spirit is different. Founded now on the convenient reasons for the truth of the Catholic Faith around the procession and divinity of the Holy Spirit.

It remains in the second place through some testimonies of the sacred Scriptures, which Muhammad commends and lauds, that what we have said about the Holy Spirit might be magnificently confirmed, confuting hence the aforesaid error of Muhammad. In the first place is that of Genesis 1, where it is said that the Spirit of the Lord hovered over the waters; where the Spirit cannot be understood except the Spirit, who is God, since this is said in the exordium of creation, when not yet anything was created. Second, the error of Muhammad is refuted from that of the Prophet, Psalm 32: "By the word of the Lord the heavens are confirmed, and by the Spirit of his mouth all their power

of them." Where it is established that the Prophet speaks of the creation of the world, which was from God alone done, with no intervening helper or extrinsic instrument. In which authority it is manifestly testified that the heavens were confirmed by the word of God, that is by the Son; it is similarly and testified that God through the Spirit of his mouth made, or created all the virtues of them. Since moreover from reason the Word is distinguished really from the speaking or enunciating, and similarly from reason the Spirit is distinguished from the inspirant; it lucidly follows that the Spirit through whom the virtues of the heavens were made is personally distinct from the inspirant, which is the proposed. Hence the Gloss upon that, "and by the Spirit of his mouth," says, that is by the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the Father, is the solidated virtue of the heavens.

Third, the error is refuted from Job 33: "The Spirit of the Lord made me, and the breath of the Omnipotent God vivified me." It is established moreover that to make man and to vivify man is the work of God alone; therefore the Holy Spirit who made and vivified man is God, and it is God. Fourth, the error is refuted from that of Isaiah 48, where the Prophet, speaking in the person of Christ, says: "And now the Lord God sent me and his Spirit"; where openly is designated the mystery of the Trinity, because here expressly is said God sent from God, and the Spirit of him; between the sent and the sender is personal distinction; and so there appears the personal distinction of the Son himself sent from the Father, and the Holy Spirit sent, from whom it is sent into flesh for the salvation of the world, and so there is also the proposed, that the Holy Spirit God is, who is said to have sent Christ, and many are other testimonies of Prophets to the same purpose to be adduced, from which we refrain for the sake of brevity.

Now from the Gospel the aforesaid error is refuted. For it is held in Matthew 1 about the Blessed Virgin, that she was found having in the womb from the Holy Spirit. Item Luke 1 is said to her: the Holy Spirit will come upon you,

and the virtue of the Most High will overshadow you. Item Luke 2 says: Simeon accepted the response from the Holy Spirit. And Luke 3 says: The Holy Spirit descended corporally in form of a dove over Christ. Item John 9: Christ says: the Spirit whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, &c. Which all things since they can convene to none except to God, it is showed more clearly by light, that the Holy Spirit is God, and one person in the Trinity.

There are moreover to this other testimonies in sacred Scripture, which would be long to note all. Ceterum the same truth is openly collected from the words of Muhammad himself, who in his Quran, from the person of God, thus says: "We gave to Jesus Son of Mary, who made wonders and manifested miracles, and perfected him through the Holy Spirit." Item he says about the Blessed Virgin: "We breathed into her from my Spirit." And in several other places similarly speaks about the Holy Spirit. Therefore it is asked of Muhammad himself and his Disciples: who is this Holy Spirit about whom he speaks, they cannot say that it is some creature, namely an Angel, for three reasons. First, because he speaks singularly about one, but Angels are many, and since all Angels are of God, it does not appear why he would say singularly of one: Ours and Holy. Second, because there would not be great commendation in this of Christ, whom however in those words Muhammad intends singularly to commend, since it is common to all men to have an Angel as a guard. Third reason and more efficacious, because the Angels do not sanctify man, but God alone. If therefore Muhammad and his followers respond that the Holy Spirit given to Jesus Christ, and to the Blessed Virgin is from God given to them, [it is] he who is true God, proceeding from the Father and Son eternally, and temporally given to Christ and the Blessed Virgin, which the Christian Religion holds and teaches.

CHAPTER X

The Fourth Error of Muhammad Is Refuted

MOREOVER, the most treacherous Muhammad, erring most gravely, denies the mystery of the Incarnation, saying that it was not necessary for human liberation or redemption, because God, being Omnipotent, could redeem the human race without the assumption of flesh. In the confutation of this present error of Muhammad and of his followers who hold the same, in the order of confutations of the other errors, it has been observed. In the first place we shall elucidate the truth of the Catholic Faith. In the second we shall adduce testimonies against the aforesaid error from the foundations themselves which Muhammad himself accepts.

Around the first, this is to be presupposed first as an indubitable foundation — namely that human Nature has fallen from the state in which it was founded — which is noted when the Savior says, Matthew 18: "The Son of man came to save what was lost"; which also he showed in the parable of the hundredth sheep, which was lost, which he sought until he found it, through which he designates human nature; which also is shown by reason from the very death itself, which would not in any way have befallen man unless he had sinned; nor is it to be estimated appropriate for God to convene, that the Creature which he had made just and ordained to Beatitude without sin, should be compelled to be miserable; man moreover dying a miserable [death], it is under guilt; therefore it is manifest that human Nature has fallen from the state of its first condition. In this regard the Apostle says in Romans 2: "Because through one man sin entered, and through sin death, thus in all men death passed through." Secondly it is presupposed that fallen human nature was repairable — and thus to be repaired — since it so was convenient, as much as to God himself, because in this is manifested the mercy of God, his power, and wisdom. Mercy indeed or goodness, because according to its own proper

Psalm it did not despise the infirmity. Power however, insomuch as nothing was found to be done in vain. For the end, to which human nature was made, is that it might see God and enjoy him; since moreover to this end it could not arrive, unless it had been repaired, it was convenient that it be repaired; furthermore this also convenes from the perfection of the universe, that the whole in a certain way is ordained to the salvation of man. To see moreover if it was necessary for divine incarnation to this [end], it is to be firmly held with the firmest faith that, although by necessity absolute by which something is said necessary without which something cannot exist, the incarnation of God was not necessary, since God through his omnipotent virtue, to whom impossible is not any word, could repair human nature by many other modes. Nonetheless by that genus of necessity, by which something is said necessary through which it arrives more conveniently and fittingly to an end, the incarnation of the Son of God was necessary for the repair of human nature. And this is what St. August. 13 about the Trinity says.

We shall show: it is not deficient to God another possible mode, whose power all things equally subiacent, but for healing our misery another mode more convenient was not. Presupposed therefore the fall of the first man, it is proved by convenient arguments that the incarnation of God was necessary and most congruent. Necessity moreover is apparent thus. Redemption is the commutation of Justice of contracts, which according to the Philosopher, Ethics 5, consists in equality of quantity. The principle moreover of Redemption equaling the guilt of human nature cannot be unless the creator himself, and not a sole creature, and this for three reasons simultaneously conjoined: namely on account of the value of redeeming from captivity, for this was the whole human nature in all its individuals, to which no creature is equal. Second on account of the infinity of the offense, because since the contempt takes the magnitude from the object, as is apparent in human things, it is apparent that the contempt of divine Majesty has annexed to itself infinite

guilt, to which the merit of any pure creature cannot be equated, since every such is of finite virtue. But it is necessary that the merit of the creature be the work of God through the union of the creature with God, so that it might thus accept infinite virtue. Third on account of the poverty of the creature, which has nothing of good which is its own, but the whole is of God, and therefore since it holds itself wholly owing to the Creator, for nothing can it satisfy for the strict right.

Moreover the congruence of the Incarnation of the Son of God is accepted doubly, namely on account of the promotion of man to good. Second quoad the removal of evil; Quoad the promotion of man to good, the congruence was, according to St. Thomas. First indeed, as much as to faith, which is more certain from this, that whoever spoke God himself believed it. Hence Augustine 11 of the City of God says: that man might walk more faithfully to truth, the very truth of God the Son having assumed man constituted and founded faith. Second as much as hope, which is maximally erected through this. Hence Augustine 13 of the Trinity says: nothing was so necessary to erecting our hope, than to show us how much God loved us. What moreover could more manifest evidence be of this justice, than that the Son of God should deign to enter into consortium of our nature? Third, as much as charity, which is maximally excited through this. Hence Augustine says in a certain sermon of the Nativity of the Lord: "What greater cause was the Advent of the Lord, unless he would show God his love in us? and afterward subdit, if it wearied to love, it will not weary to re-love." Fourth as much as correct operation in which he furnishes us an example. Hence Augustine says in a certain sermon of the Nativity of the Lord: "God was to be followed, who could not be seen; man was to be followed who could be seen; so that therefore he might be exhibited to man, and who might be seen by man, and who man would follow, God was made man." Fifth as much as the full participation of divinity, which is truly the Beatitude of man and the end of

human life, and this was collated to us through the humanity of Christ. Augustine says in a certain sermon of the Nativity of the Lord: "God was made man, so that man might become God."

Second, the congruence of the Incarnation of the Son of God is accepted on the part of the man already redeemed as to the removal of evil. First indeed because through this man is instructed how great is the dignity of human nature, lest we inquire it by sinning, whence Saint Augustine says in the book On True Religion: *God demonstrated to us what place human nature holds among creatures in the highest place in this that in true men he appeared*;[11] and Saint Pope Leo Magnus in the sermon of the Nativity of the Lord: "*Know O Christian your dignity and divine nature made a partner, do not return to the old vileness by degenerate conversation.*" [12] Second because through this man is instructed how great is the dignity of human nature, lest through the presumption of man, the grace of God having no preceding merits is commended to us in the name of Christ as is said in 3 on the Trinity. Fourth because the pride of man which is the greatest impediment lest he adhere to God, through so great humility of God can be refuted and healed. Fifth for liberating man from servitude, which as Saint Augustine says in Book 13 of the Trinity, it was necessary to do thus, that the rights of man Jesus Christ being satisfied over the devil were overcome, which was done by Christ satisfying for us. Man previously could not satisfy for the whole human race, God however was not obliged to satisfy, whence it was necessary to be Jesus Christ truly God and truly man in the unity of person, so that being true God he might bring the remedy, and being truly man he might furnish the example. Illustrated now the truth of the Catholic faith about the Incarnation of the Son of God, it is to be adduced above some testimonies of divine scriptures by

[11] *Saint Augustine; De Vera Religione, Ch. 16, Para. 30*
[12] *Saint Pope Leo Magnus; Sermons on The Nativity of Our Lord*

which both the Catholic faith might be most firmly confirmed and the error of the predicted treacherous Muhammad manifestly is reproved.

For the prophet Isaiah 7 says: "*Behold a virgin shall conceive and give birth to a son, and his name will be called Emanuel,*" which is interpreted "*God with us*," because the word of God made flesh dwelt among us, John 1 first chapter 2, and the same Prophet chapter 9, where pursuing the mystery of the Incarnation he says: "*A child is born to us, and a son is given to us, whose rule is upon his shoulder, and his name will be called Wonderful, Counselor, God, Strong Man, Father of the future age, Prince of peace*"; where the mystery of the Incarnation is fully described. First indeed in the Redeemer himself is designated human nature, when it is said: "*A child is born to us*," because in humanity by which he was a child, he was born to us temporally and it is said by the Prophet of the future through the mode of the past on account of the certainty of prophecy. Second is designated in him the divine nature, according to which he was not born temporally, but a son is given to him and the natural son of the Son of God the Father given to us according to what John 3 says: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that every man who believes in him might not perish but have eternal life." Notably it says a son not a servant, not an adoptive one, but the natural and consubstantial only-begotten, whom he loved as himself equally and gave, namely to incarnate, so that knowing Occasion. Born who would not know the beginning; given who would not know the origin; born who would even be younger than his mother, given who would not be older than the Father: Born who would die, given from whom life would be born. Third, the efficacy of his passion is touched, with which it follows, whose rule is upon his shoulder: he carries the Cross to himself saying John 19: through which he overcame the aerial powers, and entered his kingdom powerfully according to that of Luke last: it was necessary that Christ should suffer, and thus enter into his glory. Fourth, six names are described through which it appears more

splendidly how clear that boy born to us was the true God. The first name is Wonderful, namely in performing miracles surpassing every faculty of nature. The second is Counselor, as the doctor of perfection adding evangelical counsels to the precepts of the Decalogue. Third is God. In which manifestly is designated his divinity. Fourth is Mighty Conqueror of Hell. Fifth is Father of the future age, admitting the Elect to the celestial City. Sixth is Prince of eternal peace both as to conscience and supernal glory: on account of which in his nativity the Angels sang: "*Glory in the Highest to God, and on earth & in heaven.*"

Third, the same Catholic truth is solidated, and the error of the treacherous Muhammad confounded through that of Isaiah 33, where the Prophet says: "*For the Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our King; He himself will come and will save us*"; where expressly is designated the Advent of God in flesh for the salvation of the human race.

Third, the same truth of faith appears, and the error of Muhammad is confounded, from that of Isaiah 45: "*Truly you are a hidden God, God of Israel, Savior*," and below, insinuating from what salvation he speaks: "*Israel is saved in the Lord with eternal salvation*"; which however cannot be expounded of any temporal salvation of the sons of Israel, because they had no such in previous times.

Fourth, the error is confounded by the Prophet Jeremiah, who about the Incarnation mystery says, Jeremiah 23: "*Behold the days come, says the Lord, and I will raise up to David a just germ,*" that is Christ who was made from the seed of David according to the flesh, Romans 1: "*and he will reign King*" on account of which it is said in Matt. last: "Given to me is all power in heaven and on earth and the wise will be wisdom uncreated and created"; and he will make the judgment of discretion in the present discerning the faithful from infidels, calling some to faith and some dismissing to the just Judgment of God, though occult to us, and the judgment of discussion in the end of the

world, and giving the just sentence of the retribution of good and the punishment of evil, as is held Matthew 25; it follows: "*and in those days Juda will be saved, that is whoever truly confess with heart and mouth the name of the Lord, and Israel will abide confidently.*" This is referred to the state of the Church Triumphant where there is the greatest security, and this is the name by which they will call him: "*The Lord our Just one*," through which names since they can only convene, unless to God most openly is apparent that the Redeemer our Christ is not only man but true God.

Fifth, the same truth of faith appears and the error of Muhammad is confounded from the Prophet Baruch, Chapter 3 saying: "*This is our God and none other will be esteemed against him; he invented every way of discipline, and gave it to Jacob his servant, and to Israel his beloved; after these on earth he was seen, and conversed with men.*" To whom the Blessed John the Evangelist consonant is John 1: "*The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us*."

Sixth, the same truth of faith is the most manifest testimony of the Gospel, and the falsity of the error of Muhammad the most manifest, for it is said John 3: "*God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that every man who believes in him might not perish but have eternal life.*" Notably it says Son not servant, not adoptive, but natural and consubstantial only-begotten, whom he loved as himself equally and gave, namely to incarnate. Many other testimonies we could adduce, but since the adduced are most powerful, we supersede the induction of them for the sake of brevity.

CHAPTER XI

The Fifth Error of Muhammad Is Refuted

CONSEQUENTLY, the reprobate and treacherous Muhammad, although he said many glorious things about Christ — namely that he was conceived of the Holy Spirit, born of a virgin, holy in his conversation, the greatest worker of miracles; for he says that he illuminated the blind, cleansed the lepers, and raised the dead — nonetheless he fell into the greatest error in saying that Christ is not God. In this following the treacherous Heretic Nestorius; to whose founding of this error he fulfills himself with two arguments.

The first which he says, is that Christ never asserted this about himself, nor is he read to have said that he is God. The second is that he says that Christ said to the Jews: "Adore my God and your God, my Lord and your Lord"; if Christ had been God he would not have said such words, as the treacherous Muhammad says. Which heresy or infidelity indeed, conceived by the machination of the Devil, was first sowed by Arrius, then propagated by Muhammad; through Antichrist it will be completed entirely according to the intention of the devil, who not only will say that Christ is neither God nor the Son of God, but not even a good man — nothing indeed is so contrary to the enemy of the human race as the faith of Divinity in Christ.

That this infidelity of Muhammad manifestly proceeded from the very words of the demon, which Muhammad inserted word for word in his book, can most clearly be shown. Saint Augustine says in 18 of the City of God, that the philosopher Porphyry, after he miserably apostatized from Christianity, in his books which he published against the Christians, reported that the oracles of the gods were consulted and what Christ was asked. The response from the

Demons was that Christ was indeed a good man, but his Disciples had gravely sinned, who, ascribing divinity to him, confixed something he had not said of himself. Which sentence is found in many places and in the same words in his Quran. How great was this subtlety of the Devil, that he should say something good about Christ, so that if from the whole he had cursed him, he already knew he would not be believed — not caring what Christ might be thought, provided that the divinity which most greatly saves men might not be believed in him. This error moreover, even if it is sufficiently apparent and refuted from the confutation of the preceding error concerning the Incarnation, nonetheless for a fuller manifestation of the truth and to repel the most treacherous perversity of Muhammad, impugning him, we shall show manifestly that the Catholic Faith is true, asserting Christ as perfect God and a perfect man. The testimonies of this truth, the clearer ones, we take first from Prophets, second from God the Father, third from Christ himself, fourth from the Apostles themselves, fifth from the excellence of miracles of Christ himself, sixth from the testimony even of the demons, and seventh, the same appears through Muhammad from those conceded by the same.

In the first place, how the holy Prophets testify to the predicted truth of faith and detest the predicted error of the treacherous Muhammad; the outstanding King among the Prophets, David, says about Christ, Psalm 2: "*The kings of the earth were present*" — namely Herod who is called the King of Galilee, Mark 6, and Pontius Pilate who held the position of the Emperor at that time — "*and the Princes*," namely the Priests Annas, Caiphas, "*convened in one,*" that is in one will of killing Christ, "*against the Lord*," namely against God the Father — for whoever contradicts the Son contradicts the Father too — "*and against Christ his*"; and below in the person of Christ it is added: "The Lord said to me: you are my Son, I today have begotten you." "*I today,*" that is in eternity, that is nothing passes in the past nor is expected in the future.

Therefore the eternal generation of the Son by the Father is conveniently expressed through the present tense. These things are proven to be generation in the divine both because of no other can they be verified except of the Son of God whom the Father naturally and eternally begot, and because the Apostle Paul, writing to the Hebrews, used this authority at the letter to prove Christ the natural Son of God.

Second, the same is shown from Psalm 109, where from the person of the Father's speech is to the Son: "*With you is the principium.*" That is, I am and you are one principium of all things, which is not seen here, but is seen in the day of your power, that is in eternity which is the day without night, where the Divine virtue is contemplated not by all, but by the Saints when in the Resurrection they will be splendid like the Angels of God. Hence it follows in the splendors of the Saints: "from the womb," that is "*from the occult and secret substance of mine I begot you ineffably before any creature and before all times.*" From which authority most lucidly the truth of the Catholic Faith shines and the error of Muhammad is confounded.

Third, the same truth appears and the error is confounded from that of Isaiah 48, where the Prophet speaking in the person of Christ says: "*And now the Lord God sent me and his Spirit*"; where openly is designated the mystery of the Trinity because here expressly is said God sent from God, and the Spirit of him. This authority is the manifest testimony of divinity in Christ.

Item, the same is testified by the Prophet Jeremiah about Christ, Jeremiah 23: "*Behold the days come and I shall raise up to David a just germ,*" that is Christ who is made from the seed of David according to the flesh, Romans 1: "*and he will reign King*," on account of which it is said in Matt. last: "*Given to me is all power in heaven and on earth, and the wise will be wisdom*

uncreated and created"; and it follows: "*and this will be the name by which they will call him: The Lord our Just one*," through which names since they can only convene to God, it is most openly apparent from the faith that Christ our Redeemer is not only man but true God.

Secondly, the same truth appears and the error of Muhammad is confounded by the testimony of the heavenly Father; hence Matthew 3 is held: "*And behold the heavens were opened to him, namely Christ, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove coming upon him, and behold a voice from the heavens saying: This is my Son, namely natural, beloved, in whom I am well pleased.*" The same is held Luke 3: where Jesus baptized and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Spirit descended corporeally in the form of a dove upon him, and a voice was heard from heaven: "*This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*." The same testimony is held in the transfiguration of Christ, Matthew 17: "And behold a voice from the cloud said: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear him."

Third in place, the error of Muhammad is refuted by multiple testimonies of Christ himself, by which most clearly he testified himself to be the true God. For Mark 14 it is held: that the supreme priest interrogated Jesus, saying: "*You are Christ the Son of the blessed God.*" Jesus answered and said to him: "*I am, and you will see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of the virtue of God, and coming.*" Behold the manifest profession that Christ was God; whence in this response the supreme Priest rending his vestments, etc. Thus John 6 says: "*I am the bread of life, who descended from heaven; if anyone eats of this bread he will live in eternity*." It is most clear moreover that the bread of life descending from heaven, which can preserve from death and furnish eternal life both celestial and heavenly, cannot be except the true God. Whence it is manifest that in this Christ testified himself, to be God. Item John 8 says: "*I*

am the light of the World; he who follows me does not walk in darkness, but will have the light of life." Since moreover to be through essence the light and to furnish those following the light of life cannot convene except to the true God, it is most clear that in this word Christ testified himself to be the true God. The same is apparent from all those places of the Gospel where Christ says: "*I am the resurrection and life. I am the door, through me if anyone enters he will be saved.*" Since with these God alone can convene, it is manifestly testified that in this word Christ testified himself to be the true God. It appears in John 8, where interrogated by the Jews: "Who are you?" Jesus said to them: "*I am the beginning, and I speak to you.*" Alike it says Apocalypse 1: "*I am alpha and omega, the beginning and the end*"; where manifestly it is testified that he is God, since only God is believed by all to be the principle of all things from all. The same is held John 10, when the Jews wishing to stone him asked why they should stone him. They answered: "We do not stone you for good work but for blasphemy, because you, being a man, make yourself God." Item John 19: The Jews alleged the cause before Pilate why Christ should die: "*because he made himself the Son of God.*" Item after the Resurrection, the Apostle says: "*Receive the Holy Spirit, and whose sins you shall remit, they are remitted to them*"; but to give the Holy Spirit and the power of remitting sins is of God alone, as is apparent: for Isaiah 43 says: "*I am who delete iniquities and sins.*" From these it is manifestly apparent that Muhammad falsely and wickedly introduced his argument, that Christ never asserted himself to be God.

Fourth, the predicted truth is apparent by the testimony of Angels; for the Angel said to the Virgin Mary: "*What shall be born of you Holy shall be called the Son of God,*" Luke 1. Luke 2 it is held that the Angel appearing to the Shepherds in the Nativity of Christ said to them: "*I announce to you joy which will be to all peoples; born to you is the Savior of the world, who is*

Christ the Lord." And a voice from heaven was heard: "*This is my beloved Son," in whom I am well pleased.*"

Third in place, the same truth is manifest and the error of Muhammad is refuted by multiple testimony of Christ himself, by which most clearly he testified himself to be the true God. The chief priest interrogated Jesus, saying: "You are Christ the Son of the blessed God." Jesus answered and said to him: "I am, and you will see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of the virtue of God." Behold the manifest profession. Thus John 6: "*I am the bread of life, who descended from heaven.*" John 8: "*I am the light of the World, he who follows me does not walk in darkness but will have the light of life.*" From all these testimonies it is most clear that Christ truly testified himself to be God.

Many other testimonies we could easily adduce to confound the sons of betrayal, the false disciples of Muhammad, his followers; but for the sake of truth we refrain. Furthermore, in the second place, the same Truth shines more clearly by the testimony of the heavenly Father; from Matthew 3 it is held: "*And behold, the heavens were opened to him, namely Christ, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove coming upon him, and behold a voice from the heavens saying: This is my Son in whom I am well pleased.*" The same is held in Luke 3 at the baptism of Jesus, and in the transfiguration of Christ at Matthew 17.

In the sixth place, the same truth appears and the error of Muhammad is refuted through the testimony even of the demons. For Saint Augustine says in Book 18 of the City of God [13] that the philosopher Porphyry, apostatizing

[13] Saint Augustine; City of God Book 18

miserably from Christianity, reported in his books which he edited against the Christians that the oracles of the gods consulted, and about Christ what he was, were asked. The response was given from the Demons, that Christ was indeed a good man, but his Disciples had gravely sinned, who, ascribing divinity to him, fixed something he had not said about himself. Which sentence is found referred in the same words in many places in his Quran. How much subtlety this of the Devil that about Christ he should say something good! So that from the whole having cursed, he would not be believed, not caring what Christ might be thought, so long as the divinity which most greatly saves men in him is not believed. We pass over many other testimonies for the sake of brevity, since the adduced are most manifest and most powerful. Many other testimonies we could adduce but since they are manifest, for the sake of brevity we refrain from their induction.

He said in Revelation 1: "*I am the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end,*" where he manifestly testifies that he is God, since only God is believed by all to be the beginning of all things. Again, in John 10 it is recorded that when Christ asked the Jews who wished to stone him why they wanted to stone him, the Jews answered: "*We do not stone you for a good work, but for blasphemy, because you, being a man, make yourself God.*" Again, in John 19, the Jews alleging before Pilate the cause why Christ must die said: "*because he made himself the Son of God.*" Again after the Resurrection, the Apostle says: "*Receive the Holy Spirit, and those whose sins you remit are remitted to them*" — but to give the Holy Spirit and the power to remit sins belongs to God alone, as is clear from Isaiah 43: "*I am he who blots out iniquities and sins.*" From all these things it is manifestly clear that Mohammed wickedly introduced, as an argument for his error, that Christ never asserted himself to be God.

In the fourth place, the aforesaid truth is made clear by the testimony of the Angels; for the Angel said to the Virgin Mary: "*That which shall be born of you shall be called holy, the Son of God*" (Luke 1). Again in Luke 2, it is recorded that the Angel appearing to the Shepherds at the Nativity of Christ said to them: "*I announce to you a great joy which shall be for all the people; born to you is a Savior of the world, who is Christ the Lord.*"

In the fifth place, the aforesaid truth is clear from the testimony of the Apostles in the Holy Gospel. In Matthew 16, Christ interrogating his disciples: "*But who do you say that I am?*" Peter answering, as the principal among all others, speaking for himself and the others, said: "*You are Christ, the Son of the living God — natural, not adoptive like others — and consequently of the same nature as the Father.*" Whence Peter thus confessed the truth of the divine and human nature in the same person. Which confession Christ commending and rewarding said: "*Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jonah, because flesh and blood — that is, mortal man — has not revealed this truth to you, but my Father who is in heaven; and I say to you, that you are Peter, and upon this rock*" — that is, upon this faith he professed — "*I will build my Church," and below: "and to you I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.*" Again in John 6, when Christ said to the twelve: "*Do you also wish to go away?*" Simon Peter answering for himself and the others said: "*Lord, to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life, and we believe and know that you are the Christ, the Son of God — that is, natural.*" Again in John 20, after the Resurrection of Christ, when Christ said to Thomas who doubted: "*Put your finger here and see my hands and feet, etc., be not unbelieving but faithful,*" Thomas answered: "*My Lord and my God!*" where the Divinity in Christ is manifestly confessed against the perfidy of Arius and Mohammed. Again in John 1: "*I bear witness, because this is the Son — namely, my natural Son.*"

In the sixth place, the truth of divinity in Christ is attested by the very eminence of the miracles which Christ performed. Whence he himself says in John 5: "*The very works which I do bear testimony of me, that the Father has sent me*" — and this is most true, since the miracles which Christ performed were most sufficient testimonies for manifesting his divinity, according to three considerations as Saint Thomas notes. First, according to the very species of the works, which transcend all power of created virtue, and therefore could not be done except by divine power; and because of this the blind man who was enlightened said in John 9: "*From the beginning of the world it has not been heard that any one opened the eyes of one born blind, unless he were from God*." Second, because of the manner of performing miracles, because he performed them by his own power — not by praying as others did — whence it is said in Luke 6: "*That virtue went out from him and healed all.*" By reason of which it is shown, as Cyril says, that he received no alien power, but being naturally God, he showed his own power over the infirm, and therefore in numberless miracles he performed. Third, from his own doctrine, by which he called himself God, which, unless it were true, would not be confirmed by miracles performed by divine power; and therefore it is said in Mark 1: "*What new doctrine is this? For he commands with authority even the unclean spirits and they obey him.*"

It is marvellous indeed how Mohammed, who commends the Prophets and the Gospel so much, was so occupied with such blindness and struck with such dullness of mind that he did not understand such open, and indeed most splendid, testimonies of the Divinity in Christ. Moreover, for a more complete refutation of the error of Mohammed in his own words — which in the Quran he brings in praise of Christ — we take up arms against him. For commending Christ, among other things, he calls him the Word of God. This is not to be understood as Christ merely having proclaimed the words of God, because this is common to other Prophets; whence David says in Psalm 118: "*I have*

declared all the words of your mouth." Nor is it because one who proclaims the words of God is thereby called the Word of God — for no Prophet is ever called the Word of God except Christ alone, in John 1, where it is said: "In the beginning was the Word." And now likewise in the Quran. Therefore it is necessary that when Christ is called the Word of God, it is not to be taken as a vocal, fleeting word, but properly, really, and substantially, and personally; and thus the Word is eternal, proceeding from the paternal Intellect. Now that which proceeds from God, as we showed above, is essentially God, being of the generation of the Son of God. Thus it is manifest from the very concessions of Mohammed himself that Christ was the true God.

From all which testimonies it is clearly understood that the perfidious Mohammed must either believe Christ to be the true God, or else he falsely commended the prophecies and the Gospel. As for that which Mohammed adduces to strengthen his error — that Christ said to the Jews: "*Adore my God and your God, my Lord and your Lord*" — we answer that this is not found in the Gospel that Christ said this to the Jews; nonetheless it is read in John 20 that he said it as said to the Apostles: "*I ascend to my Father and your Father, my God and your God.*" We say that this is to be understood as said by him according to human nature, according to which he himself says in John 14: "*The Father is greater than I*" — not according to divine nature, according to which he himself says in John 10: "*I and the Father are one*" — according to which nature the Son is equal to the Father. Whence as Augustine says in the first Book on the Trinity, scripture rightly calls them equal — namely the Father to the Son equal, and the Father greater than the Son: the former because of the form of God, the latter because of the form of a servant — without any comparison.[14]

[14] Saint Augustine; De Trinitate Book 1

Chapter XII — The Sixth Error of Mohammed Refuted

Moreover, the perfidious Mohammed, adding errors to errors, denies that Christ was dead, but rather asserts that another similar to him was substituted. Whence in the Quran Chapter 4, he thus speaks, inciting the Jews: they bring upon themselves the greatest blasphemy and immoderate insult, because they maintain that Christ, the Son of Mary, the Messenger of God, came — but by no means was he himself crucified; rather those who suspended one similar to him killed him — but God, incomprehensible and wise, transported him to himself. [15]

O how pernicious an error! O how most damnable, which takes from us all antidotes of salvation! For from this, since Mohammed denies that Christ died, he consequently denies all the sacraments, which derive their efficacy from the power of the Passion of Christ. Whence he places no true sacraments at all, in which respect he is shown more pernicious than all Heretics. Moreover, because the Saracens deny the death of Christ, they deride the Cross of the Lord and the place of his burial; yet Mohammed says in his Quran that Christ at the end of the World will die and rise again with the rest. Indeed this error is most pernicious, since it takes from us the benefit of Redemption, which we mercifully received through the Passion and death of Christ. Regarding the refutation of this error, observing the order used in other matters, we will first establish the truth of faith which the holy Christian religion believes and holds, namely that Christ truly died for the liberation and redemption of the human race. In the second place we will adduce testimonies for refuting this error of Mohammed, from those places of scriptures which Mohammed himself praises and accepts.

[15] An-Nisa 4:157-158

Regarding the first, we presuppose with the truth that since God's works are perfect — Deuteronomy 22: "*In all his works exceedingly*" — pertaining to the government of the human race, both his mercy and his justice should shine simultaneously. Whence Psalm 24 says: "*All the ways of the Lord are mercy and truth,*" that is, justice. Whence in the redemption of the human race there ought not to shine only divine mercy — as though by pardoning or remitting sins by will alone — but also divine justice should shine, namely for the offense committed against God, since it pertains to justice to leave no evil unpunished. From which it is clear that for the perfection of human redemption it was fitting that justice should so shine in it that the sin of man should not be relaxed without due satisfaction.

Moreover, since the satisfaction to be made by Christ ought not to be made for one man only, but for all human nature, it necessarily had to fulfill two conditions: one, that it should be universal with respect to all satisfactions; the second, that it should be exemplary with respect to all particular satisfactions. Now the universal ought not to be achieved by multiplication of many satisfactions, but by having power in respect of all. Whence it was not required that Christ himself should suffer all punishments that can follow from any sin whatsoever, but rather that one punishment to which all are ordered — which contains in itself all punishments — should be endured. And that punishment is death, the end of all terrible things, as the Philosopher says in the third book of the Ethics. Whence justice determined that the satisfaction to be made by passion and death ought to be made by Christ.

In as much as it also ought to be exemplary with respect to our satisfactions, it ought to have a magnitude exceeding all other satisfactions, because the exemplar ought to be more excellent than the thing exemplified, and therefore according to the greatest punishment it ought to satisfy — namely by Passion

and death — and thus Christ by his Passion and death satisfied sufficiently for the human race.

Moreover, the fittingness of this — that Christ who was to satisfy the human race ought to die — is gathered openly from the fact that the human race was adjudicated to death on account of sin, according to Genesis 2: "*In whatever day you eat, you shall die by death.*" And it is a fitting mode of satisfying when one submits himself to the punishment which another deserved; and therefore it was fitting that Christ, who came to satisfy the human race, should be willing to die. Whence 1 Peter 3: "*Christ once died for our sins*."

If indeed Mohammed or another should reply to this that the life which Christ gave by Passion for the redemption of the human race was corporeal, and therefore not sufficient to compensate for the spiritual life which man had lost through sin — since nothing corporeal is equivalent to the spiritual — we answer that this argument is invalid, as proceeding from a defect of consideration. For thus arguing, he ought not to consider the life of Christ only according to the nature of humanity, but according to the person taking flesh and suffering in it — in as much, namely, as it was the flesh and life of God, from which it had infinite dignity. Whence the bodily life of Christ had infinite value from the divinity joined to it, in as much as it was not the life of a pure man but of God and man, and therefore it could be a sufficient recompense for the spiritual life for satisfying for all the sins of the human race, and principally by reason of the most excellent charity from which it was offered.

Having now declared, according to our smallness, the truth of the Christian faith regarding the fittingness of the death of Christ for the redemption of the human race, it remains, observing our order, to adduce testimonies commended and praised by Mohammed himself, through which the truth of

our faith may shine more splendidly, and the error of Mohammed be shown more openly, falsely, and perniciously.

First among these occurs the eminent Prophet David, who speaking in the person of Christ says in Psalm 68: "*What I did not take away I then paid*" — the gloss of Ambrose: as if to say, I did not sin, and yet I gave satisfaction. For Adam and Eve, who presumptuously wished as the devil to seize divinity from divinity, were lost and lost their happiness. But when Christ paid, it is understood that he perfectly satisfied for our sins.

In the second place there occurs a notable passage of the Prophet Isaiah, who in Chapter 53 speaks literally of Christ thus: "*Truly he himself bore our infirmities and he himself carried our sorrows. He was wounded for our iniquities, he was crushed for our crimes; the discipline of our peace was upon him, and by his bruise we were healed. All we like sheep have gone astray, everyone has declined in his own way, and God placed upon him iniquity — that is, the punishment for the expiation of all the iniquities of all of us.*" And because Christ endured this punishment from the greatest charity, it is subjoined: "He was offered because he himself willed" — that is, on account of obedience to the Father, and for the liberation of the human race — and he did not open his mouth, namely by resisting verbally, but rather kept silent before those who falsely accused him and unjustly condemned him, as is evident from the Gospel.

Third, the same Prophet speaking of the baseness of his death, says above: "*and he was reputed with the wicked, because he was crucified among thieves, so that through this, as a sharer in their crime, he might be considered by the common people to have borne the sins of many and prayed for transgressors*" — whence Luke 23: "*Father, forgive them, because they do not know what they do*."

In the fourth place there offers himself as a most truthful witness the Prophet Jeremiah, who in the first of the Lamentations, speaking in the person of Christ, thus says: "*O all you who pass by the way, see if there is sorrow like my sorrow.*" In which words his most bitter Passion is demonstrated.

Let us come now to the testimonies of the Holy Gospel, which Mohammed himself so magnificently praises, and there are many testimonies, clearer than light. In Matthew 20, Christ says of himself and not of another: "*Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man shall be delivered to the chief priests and scribes and they shall condemn him to death and shall deliver him to the nations to be mocked and scourged, and the third day he shall rise again.*" Again in Luke 18 and Luke 23, it is recorded that the two disciples going to the castle of Emmaus, and doubting about the Resurrection of Christ, Christ appearing to them said: "*O foolish and slow of heart to believe in all things which the Prophets have spoken. Ought not Christ to have suffered and so to enter into his glory?*" Christ ought indeed to have suffered: first, because of the ordination of the Father; second, because of his own exaltation; third, because of human redemption; and also because of the fulfillment of the scriptures — because of which what follows, and beginning from Moses and all the Prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures which were about him.

Third, there occurs that of John 11: "*It is expedient that one man die for the people so that the whole nation perish not*." Which indeed Caiaphas said prophetically, as the Evangelist testifies. Again in John 3, Christ says: "*As Moses exalted the serpent in the desert, so must the Son of Man be exalted, so that all who believe in him may not perish but have eternal life*" — which is to be understood of the exaltation of the cross. Again in John 19, he says: "*When therefore Jesus had received the vinegar, he said: It is consummated; and bowing his head he gave up the spirit.*"

What more? The whole Gospel is full of these testimonies, whence it is certainly marvellous, that where there are such splendid lights attesting the death of Christ, the perfidious Mohammed denying that Christ was dead should be blinded. And yet his own error — which is to be called more folly than anything else — is most openly elicited from his own words in the Quran; for he says in Chapter 33, speaking in the person of Christ while he was conversing among men: "***He has made me a blessing wherever I go, and bid me to establish prayer and give alms-tax as long as I live, and to be kind to my mother. He has not made me arrogant or defiant. Peace be upon me the day I was born, the day I die, and the day I will be raised back to life!***" [16] Let these things about the refutation of the present error suffice.

Chapter XIII — The Seventh Error of Mohammed Refuted

Moreover, the perfidious Mohammed, just as he denies divinity in Christ, so he denies judicial power. For he denies that Christ will judge at the end of the age. He says in Chapter 14 of the Quran that Allah alone will judge [17], and not Christ; but at the sound of the trumpet of the Angel of death, Jesus Christ together with Angels and Demons and all other living creatures — God the Creator alone remaining alive — will die and rise again together with all. Observing the method used in other matters regarding the impugnation of this error — because the falsity of similar errors from those above is manifestly clear in light — we will first establish the truth of the Christian faith. Second, we will adduce both for the confirmation of that truth and for the refutation of the aforesaid error of Mohammed, testimonies from those holy sources of scripture which Mohammed himself praises. Regarding the first, it must be firmly believed that judicial power befits Christ, both according to divine

[16] Surah al-Maryam 19:31-33
[17] Surah Ibrahim 14:48

nature and according to human nature. According to divine nature it is clear: since as the Father does all things by his Word — since it is the art of the Omnipotent God — in John 1: "All things were made by him," that is, the Word; and in Psalm: "*By the Word of the Lord the heavens were established.*" Thus he judges all things by his own Word. For the reason of judgment is the wise law of truth, according to which judgment is given; but since the Son of God is wisdom begotten and truth proceeding from the Father, and he perfectly represents the Father, judicial power is to be attributed to him. And this is what is said in John 5: "*The Father gave all judgment to the Son,*" which is said because judgment is by divine wisdom. Now all wisdom is communicated to the Son, and consequently judicial power. Judicial power also befits Christ according to human nature because of the dignity of the head, according to that of John 5: "*He gave him power to make judgment, because he is the Son of Man*." Whence all human things are subject to his judgment, which we can gather from three considerations.

First, if we consider the disposition of the soul of Christ toward the Word of God: for if the spiritual man judges all things, as the Apostle says in 1 Corinthians 2, much more the soul of Christ — which is full of the truth of the Word of God — has judgment over all things. Second, the same appears from the merit of his death, because as it is said in John 14: "*In this Christ died and rose again, that he might be Lord of the living and the dead*," and therefore he has judgment over all; on account of which the Apostle there subjoins that "*we shall all stand before the Tribunal of Christ*"; and Daniel 7 says: "*He gave him all power, and honor, and kingdom, and all peoples, tribes, and tongues shall serve him.*" Third, the same appears from a comparison of human things to the end of human salvation. For to whomsoever the principal is committed, the accessory is also committed. Now all human affairs are ordered to the end of Beatitude, which is eternal salvation, to which men are admitted or repelled by

the judgment of Christ. As is evident from Matthew 25. Whence it is manifest that all human affairs pertain to the judicial power of Christ. Moreover, judicial power is most rightly attributed to Christ, because according to divine justice it befits him to be the Judge who fought for divine justice and was unjustly judged. Whence he himself says in Revelation 3: "*I have overcome and I sit in the throne of my Father.*" By "*throne*" moreover is understood judicial power, according to Psalm 9: "*He sat upon the throne who judges justice*," and thus judicial power befits Christ both because of the Divine Person, because of the dignity of the head, because of the fullness of habitual grace, and also from the merit of his death he obtained it. Having declared the truth of faith, let us proceed adducing the testimonies refuting the error of Mohammed.

First occurs the Royal Prophet David, who in Psalm 72 speaking to the Father of Christ says: "*O God, give your judgment to the King*" — the gloss: God the Father, give your judgment to the King, that is to Christ, as if he were to say: Do what I foresaw would be future. For the Father does not judge anyone, but has given all judgment to the Son — not that the whole Trinity does not judge at the same time, but because only the Person of the Son according to humanity will be seen by men in judgment.

Second, the Prophet Jeremiah in Jeremiah 23, speaking from the person of God the Father, says: "*Behold the days come, and I will raise up David*" — that is, Christ descending from David according to the flesh — "*and he shall reign as King, and he shall be wise, and he shall do judgment and justice in the earth.*"

Third, there is that of Job, who in the 36th chapter of his book speaking of Christ says: "Your cause was judged as if impious" — that is, judged by Pilate — "and you shall receive the cause and judgment as judges." Because as

Augustine says in the book on the Words of the Lord: "*He will sit as Judge who stood under a judge; he will condemn the truly guilty who was falsely made guilty.*"

Fourth, there occurs the holy Daniel, who speaking of Christ says in chapter 7: "*Behold, as if the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came up to the Ancient of Days and came to him, and he gave him power, and honor, and kingdom, and all peoples, tribes, and tongues will serve him.*"

Fifth, there occurs the testimony from the Gospel. In Matthew chapter 19, Christ most openly refutes the aforesaid error of Mohammed saying: "Amen Amen I say to you, that you who have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the seat of his Majesty, you also shall sit judging the twelve tribes of Israel." And Matthew 25 says: "*When the Son of Man shall come*" — and though he is the same Son of God and Son of Man, yet he makes mention of the Son of Man, because he will come in human form to judgment in his Majesty, since then he will appear in glorious form, as in the first coming he appeared in passible and infirm form. "*And all his Angels with him*" — both because of the honor of the Judge, and because of the execution of judgment; because by the ministry of the holy Angels the elect will be led to heaven, and through the evil Angels the reprobate will be dragged to hell. "*He will sit upon the seat of his Majesty.*" By this is designated the judicial power which is given to Christ, the man. "*And all nations will be gathered before him*" — because no one will be able to hide then — and thus it is said in Acts 10: "*Christ was constituted by God the Father judge of the living and the dead.*" From all which the aforesaid error of Mohammed is sufficiently refuted.

Chapter XIV — The Eighth Error of Mohammed Refuted

Moreover the perfidious Mohammed and his followers the Saracens, seeing against them so many, and indeed such clear testimonies from the very sacred scriptures which they themselves commend, pretended — to color the errors of their kind — that the Jews had corrupted the law of Moses, and the Christians the Gospel, and that nothing remained of the truth of the law and Gospel except what is in the Quran. This fiction, though it contains a manifest falsity and error — especially since it offers no proof; indeed according to all laws one alleging that certain writings have been corrupted should be held to prove it — nevertheless, for a greater exposure of the perfidious Mohammed and the Saracens, we will refute this falsity and error, both by the authorities of holy scripture and by evident reasons. Briefly, however, because this fiction is so manifestly false that it is not necessary to adduce many testimonies to show it.

First there occurs to us that which is in Psalm 49. The Prophet, speaking of the durability and firmness of the Church even to the end of the age, says: "*In the city of our God, God has founded it forever*." And as the Prophet Hosea says: the just man lives by faith; the Church is said to last, or the people of God, as long as faith perseveres in it. Whence Jerome: "*Where faith, there the Church: therefore as long as the Church lasts, faith will remain uncorrupted*." [18]Since therefore the Church will remain by the divine promise, by the same promise faith will remain uncorrupt.

Second, the Prophet Baruch speaking of the law of God in chapter 2: "*the law which is in eternal*" — therefore it is not corrupted.

[18] Saint Jerome; Dialogue Against the Luciferians, Sect. 28

Third, from the Prophet David, Psalm 118: "*Forever O Lord your word stands, and from age to age your truth*" — and thus the same as before.

Fourth, to the same purpose is what the illustrious Prophet Isaiah, in chapter 9, says of Christ: "*He will sit upon the throne of David and upon his Kingdom to confirm and strengthen it in judgment and justice forever.*" Whence the Angel Gabriel, consonant with the Prophet, says in Luke 1: "*The Lord God will give him the seat of David his father, and he will reign in the house of Jacob forever*." Now when he does not reign in the house of Jacob — quasi of believers — except through faith and charity; if faith were corrupted and vitiated, his kingdom would no longer remain: yet Christ himself says in Matthew last: "*Behold I am with you even to the consummation of the age*."

Fifth, there occurs the Prophet Hosea, in the person of the Lord speaking of his holy Church in chapter 2: "*I will espouse you to me forever in faith.*" If therefore the marriage of Christ and the Church must be eternal, God would never permit his faith to be corrupted or vitiated universally, since by the corrupted faith the marriage would be dissolved.

Sixth, this error is disproved from the Gospel. First from that of Matthew 16, where Christ, to Peter confessing him to be the Son of God, says: "*Upon this rock*" — that is faith, which he professed — "*I will build my Church,*" and it follows: "And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Secondly, Luke 22, where Christ promises Peter: "*But I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail*" — therefore the faith of Peter was to remain even to the end.

Seventh, to the same purpose is that of Revelation 14: "*I saw another Angel flying through the midst of heaven having the eternal Gospel*" — and since testimonies of such great authority could not stand in truth if the law and Gospel were corrupted, the manifest falsity and malice of Mohammed and the

Saracens who say the law and Gospel are corrupted is clear. Moreover, the aforesaid error is refuted by reason.

First, such a corruption of the aforesaid scriptures could not have been general and manifest, because if the other nations had notice of this corruption, then this corruption would have been notorious — but this is manifestly and notoriously false. Nor could it have been particular and hidden, because some integral and uncorrupted codes would have remained — which is false; for in every language and in every Province or Region the law and Gospel are found uniformly written.

Second, the text of the old law is thus preserved among the Hebrews in its own language and in the very letter in which it was given to the Fathers by Moses at Sinai; and after they were expelled from the land of promise and dispersed through the world, they hold the same law everywhere without any variation. Therefore such corruption cannot be applied to the Old Testament, and much less to the New, as is thus evident. For the four Gospels were not written at the same time, nor in the same place, nor in the same language, nor by the same author — namely Matthew in Judaea in Hebrew, John in Greek in Greece, Luke in Achaia also in Greek, Mark in Italy in Latin — and their translation was made by Blessed Jerome and others before the time of Mohammed, and exemplars remained in all languages. Therefore they could not be corrupted by some forgers, since it would manifestly be known — but this was not the opinion of others — Therefore Mohammed says is a fiction and a malicious delusion.

Third, this is manifestly shown to be most false, because still the original books of some Prophets and Evangelists are found among Christians, which were written before Mohammed was born, and all agree with others later written: therefore etc.

Fourth: how could Christians agree with Jews in such a corruption, from whom they are divided by such an ancient hatred? How could Christians and Jews agree in a corruption regarding the very thing in which they most greatly disagree — namely Christ, whom the Jews say is neither God nor a good man, while Christians say he is not only the most holy of all, but also the true God.

Fifth, moreover, from the very sayings of Mohammed himself: he himself first commands the observance of the law and Gospel. I ask from him whether those which are with us are the authentic ones — and this not because he says they are corrupted, nor even that others exist in their place, since no such others are found in the whole world, as is manifest: therefore etc.

Sixth: he himself in the Quran says in the chapter of Jonah: "***If you ˹O Prophet˺ are in doubt about ˹these stories˺ that We have revealed to you, then ask those who read the Scripture before you. The truth has certainly come to you from your Lord, so do not be one of those who doubt,***" Now those who read the book before the Saracens were Jews and Christians, who received the Pentateuch and Gospel as Mohammed himself expounds it.[19] Therefore Mohammed commands the Saracens to ask of Christians and Jews about doubts; but how could Mohammed send all to the lies of Mohammed, if he were a true prophet as the Saracens themselves say? The books of the Jews and Christians were therefore not corrupted in the time of Mohammed. Nor can they say that they were corrupted afterward. For it is said in the Quran in the chapter called Elchagar (which is interpreted "stone"): "We in the person of God caused the remembrance of God to descend, and we preserve the same." Now the law of Moses and the holy Gospel among the Saracens are called "concordat"; therefore God always preserved for his faithful the testimony of his scripture before Mohammed, and will preserve it afterward.

[19] Surah Yunus 10:94

Seventh, the aforesaid error is thus disproved: if the Saracens altogether wish to say that the law of Moses and the Gospel are corrupted or vitiated, let them show us the law of Moses and the Gospel uncorrupted, and let us receive them — especially if they show it uniformly in all languages, as we have shown. But this is impossible for them: therefore it is false what Mohammed says, that the law of Moses and the Gospel are corrupted. But the fiction was malicious and pernicious, for keeping people blinded in its errors.

Chapter XV — The Ninth Error of Mohammed Refuted

The perfidious Mohammed so far remained bestial that he erred not only in the pure truths of holy faith, but also in those things which are most clear to every good philosopher, as being first principles. For he asserts that God has a body and members of a body, such as hands, feet, etc. In this he followed the heretics called Anthropomorphites, who through rustic simplicity thought that God had human members. Whence he says in the vision of which he spoke above in his fables that God touched him with his hand between the shoulders, to such a degree that the coldness of his hand reached even to the marrow of his back.[20] "***So I saw Him place His Palm between my shoulders, and I sensed the coolness of His Fingertips between my breast. Then everything was disclosed for me, and I became aware.***" Touch however cannot be other than corporeal, as the whole of philosophy attests; which error is manifestly confounded by the authorities of holy scripture and by reasons.

First there occurs that passage of Wisdom 1: "*The Spirit of the Lord fills the orb of the earth,*" which however is impossible to befit a corporeal thing.

Second, through the Prophet the Lord God speaking says in Isaiah 23: "*Heaven and earth I fill*" — and this however is impossible to befit a corporeal thing.

Third, more expressly it is refuted through the Gospel of John, where John 4 it is said: "*God is spirit*" — therefore consequently not corporeal, since as Luke last says: "*A spirit has not flesh and bones*." Moreover the aforesaid error is confounded by reasons, and according to six attributes which not only

[20] Jami' at-Tirmidhi 3235

every Christian but every good philosopher — according to the Metaphysics of Aristotle — attributed to God: six reasons are adduced.

The first attribute of God is that he is the first being. From this it is thus first argued: every composite of whatever kind is every corporeal thing; it is posterior to its component parts. But God is the first being; therefore it is impossible that God be composed of any component parts.

The second attribute of God is that he is the most simple being by the negation of all composition and composability, as the whole of philosophy exclaims; from which it is thus argued: every corporeal thing has component parts, but nothing such is altogether simple. Therefore since God is altogether simple, it is impossible that he in any way be corporeal.

The third attribute of God is that he be pure act, from which it is thus argued. God is pure act; therefore it is impossible that he be composed, which every corporeal thing is. The consequence is evident, because in every composite it is necessary that there be act and potency; for many things cannot simply become one unless something is in act and another in potency — for those which are in act are not united unless as it were bound together, which are not one simply.

The fourth attribute of God is that he is the most noble being in the nobility of being. From this it is thus argued: no corporeal thing can be the most noble being of all beings; it is clear because spirit is of a nobler and higher nature. Since therefore God is the most noble being, it manifestly appears that it is impossible that he be a body or a corporeal thing.

The fifth attribute of God is that he is eternal. From this it is thus argued: if God were corporeal he would necessarily be composite; but every composite is compounded by another; if therefore he were compounded by another, then he himself would not be God, but that one rather who composed him.

Moreover if he were composed by another he would not be eternal, since with his composition he would begin to be: therefore it is manifestly clear that this error is foolish.

The sixth attribute of God is that he be necessarily existing. From this it is thus argued: every composite is potentially dissoluble, as much as pertains to the reason of composition, though in some it is something repugnant to dissolution. Now that which is dissoluble in potency is in potency toward non-being, which cannot befit God since he is necessarily existing: therefore it is impossible that in God there be composition, and consequently that he be corporeal.

It ought not to have moved Mohammed to the assertion of this error — any more than any other — that holy scripture attributes to God a triple dimension. For it is said in Job 11: "*He is higher than heaven, and deeper than hell, whence do you know; longer than the earth is his measure, and broader than the sea.*" And the lineaments of members which are described as of a fragile and composite man — namely about eyes, face, head, hands, arms, fingers, womb, feet, as in Job 41: "*Have you an arm as God?*" And in Psalm: "*The eyes of the Lord are upon the just, and his right hand made virtue*" — and similar things, which according to the letter cannot without nefarious sacrilege be understood of him who is invisible, ineffable, incomprehensible, inestimable, simple, and incomposite. It is necessary that we understand by such signification of members the divine efficiencies and immense operations, which cannot be intimated to us otherwise than through these customary words; therefore of necessity holy scripture delivered to us spiritual and divine things under likenesses of corporeal things. Whence Hosea 12 says: "*The Lord says: I multiplied visions to them, and in the hands of the Prophets I was likened to them*" — and this was fittingly done, for God provides for all according to what their nature requires. Now it is natural to man that through

sensible things he arrive at intelligible things, because all our cognition has its beginning from sense. Whence conveniently in sacred scripture spiritual things are delivered to us under metaphors of corporeal things. Whence when scripture attributes a triple dimension to God, under the likeness of corporeal quantity it designates virtual quantity: by depth, the power of knowing occult things; by height, the excellence of virtue above all things; by length, that his being is permanent; by breadth, the affection of love toward all things. As Dionysius says in the 9th chapter on the Divine Names: by depth is understood the incomprehensibility of his essence; by length, the procession of virtue penetrating all things; by breadth moreover, the extension of him to all things, in as much as all things are contained in God in his protection. Thus also corporeal parts are attributed to God in scriptures by reason of his acts and operations — as for the signification of speech, his locution which is gently infused into the secret sense of the soul, or that he thus spoke to our fathers and the Prophets. In the eyes we recognize the immensity of his perspicacity by which he surveys and perceives all things; by the naming of hands, his providence and operation by which he is the creator and founder of all things we perceive; and his arm, the virtue and governance by which he sustains, moderates, and rules all things; and similarly of other parts.

Chapter XVI — The Tenth Error of Mohammed Refuted

Consequently, the foolish and malicious Mohammed, adding error to errors, says that God is the cause of all sins. Whence he says that if God wished, he would make all nations one nation; but this one goes astray, the other proceeds along the straight way [21] — it profits him according to his will — who will spread errors even to the end of the world. Whence crying out he says:

[21] An-Nahl 16:93

"***Whoever Allah guides is truly guided. And whoever He leaves to stray, they are the ˹true˺ losers.***" [22]

Indeed this error is excessively dangerous and pernicious, and most injurious to divine goodness; for it provides to sinners an occasion of persevering in sins, and of deflecting their own faults and sins back onto God. But this error is easily disproved; for which it should be noted that a man is in two ways the cause of the sin of another: in one way by directly inclining his will to sin; in another way indirectly, namely by not withdrawing some from sin. Whence in Ezekiel 3 the Lord says to the watchman: "*If you have not announced to the wicked, etc., you shall die; I will require his blood from your hand.*" Now that God could in no way be the cause of sin is manifestly shown.

First indeed directly: every mortal sin is an aversion from the ultimate end; but it is impossible that God make the will of anyone be averted from the ultimate end, since he himself is the ultimate end. Indeed God himself inclines all things and converts them into himself as into the ultimate end, as Dionysius says.[23] Therefore it is impossible that God be the cause of any departure from the order which is toward him himself, in which the nature of sin consists.

Second, this aforesaid error is driven out from Wisdom 11: "*You love all things which are, and you hate none of the things which you made*"; moreover God hates sin and the errors of men: according to Wisdom 14: "Equally hated by God are the impious and his impiety." And Ecclesiasticus 15: "*God hates all the excess of error.*" Also Psalm 5: "*You have hated all who work iniquity*" — therefore God cannot be said to be the cause of sin in the first way, namely directly.

---

[22] Al-A'raf 7:178
[23] Saint Dionysus; On The Divine Names Ch. 2

Third, the same truth is clear and the aforesaid error is trampled down from that of John 1: "*Without him nothing was made*" — that is, sin.

Fourth, by reason the same truth is thus shown: God is not the actor of that whose avenger he is, as is manifest; but God is the avenger of sins and errors of men, Deuteronomy 32: "Mine is vengeance, and I will repay." And in Psalm: "I will destroy all the sinners of the earth," and Isaiah 46: "That day of the Lord of hosts, the day of vengeance, to take vengeance on his enemies" — therefore God is not to be said the cause of sins.

Fifth thus: sin and error are said to be a privation and disordered defect lacking the due end; but to make such a defect is repugnant to divine power, wisdom, and goodness — for in sin there is a privation of utility, of order, and of being — therefore since nothing is to be attributed to God except what befits his power, wisdom, and goodness, it is manifest that to attribute to him the being a cause of sins is not only falsity but blasphemy and impiety.

Moreover, that God cannot be said to be the cause of sin in the second way — namely indirectly — is clear. Though it may indeed happen that God does not grant to some the auxiliary help for avoiding sins, which if he granted they would not sin, yet he does this according to the order of his wisdom and justice, since he himself is the very divine Wisdom and justice. Whence it is not imputed to him that anyone sins as the cause of sin — just as the helmsman is not called the cause of the shipwreck of the ship from the fact that he does not govern the ship, except when by withdrawing the governance he is both able and obliged to govern. Now God according to just judgment does what he does not provide auxiliary help to some so that they do not fall — which is because they themselves provide an impediment to grace in as much as they are averted from the light, as Saint Dionysius says.[24] Therefore it is clear that God in no way has the causality of sins or errors attributed to him;

[24] Saint Dionysus; On The Divine Names, Ch. 4

for Saint Augustine says in Book 83 on Diverse Questions: "*With almost no man suffering, Man, the Author [of his moral decline] makes man worse.*" [25] Now God is more excellent than every wise man — much less therefore does God as author or wishing make man worse, and thus the falsity of the aforesaid error of Mohammed is clear in most bright light.

Chapter XVII — The Eleventh Error of Mohammed Refuted

Consequently the perfidious Mohammed seemed to assert that all these worldly things are random and fortuitous, and not governed by divine providence; for he says in the Quran Chapter 3: ": "***If a wound should touch you—there has already touched the [opposing] people a wound similar to it. And these days [of victory and defeat.***"[26] and in Chapter 57, he says: "***Know that this worldly life is no more than play, amusement, luxury, mutual boasting, and competition in wealth and children. This is like rain that causes plants to grow, to the delight of the planters. But later the plants dry up and you see them wither, then they are reduced to chaff. And in the Hereafter there will be either severe punishment or forgiveness and pleasure of Allah, whereas the life of this world is no more than the delusion of enjoyment.***" [27] In which error the perfidious Mohammed has followed the error of certain ancient Philosophers such as the Democriteans and the Epicureans, who said that this world is not governed by divine providence, but that all things arise from chance and fortune. But this error is easily shown to be false, foolish, and impossible.

For who, as Lactantius says, would not perceive that this world so admirably perfected by reason is governed by some providence? When indeed nothing is

---

[25] Saint Augustine; On Diverse Questions Octoginta Tribus, Q. 4
[26] Ali ‘Imran 3:140
[27] Al-Hadid 57:20

which could exist without some Governor — just as a house deserted by its Inhabitant falls to pieces, a ship without a Helmsman goes badly astray, the body left by the soul fails immediately — we should not even suppose that such a great mass could be built without an Artificer, or could subsist for so long without a Rector.

Let us show the falsity of that error in the way in which we refuted those above, namely by the testimonies of sacred letters and by truthful reasons.

First, the falsity is shown from Wisdom 8: "*Divine Wisdom, which attains from end to end mightily, and disposes all things sweetly." Second, from Wisdom 14: "But you, Father, governing all things with providence.*"

By reason moreover the aforesaid error is refuted and it is proved that all things — both good and bad, both necessary and contingent, both universal and individual — are governed by divine providence, thus: toward whatever order divine providence attains, those things are subject to the same providence; but the order of divine providence attains to all things, because all things are ordered to some universal good — in as much as if by some malice they in one way depart from it, they are immediately in another way ordered into him — whether it be a bad thing of nature, because the corruption of one is the generation of another, and the deformity of monsters commends the natural proportion of the body; or whether it be a bad thing of fault, because it commends the honesty of virtue and through divine punishment, divine justice.

Second thus: whatever things have a certain order must be governed by some providence; but the things of this world hold a certain order in their movements; therefore it is necessary to say that they are governed by some providence and not by chance or fortune.

Third thus: those diverse things are not preserved in any conjunction except through some governing providence; but in the world we see contraries and diverse things collected to remain at the same time; therefore the world itself is governed by providence.

Fourth thus: every thing which per se cannot stand, nor can per se be preserved, needs some Governor by which it is preserved; but created things cannot per se exist and be preserved, because those things which are made from nothing of themselves tend toward nothing, as Damascene says. Therefore it is necessary to say that worldly things, since they are created by God, are governed by divine providence. That moreover this is true not only of natural things but also of human acts is evident both from that of Matthew 10: "*All the hairs of your head are numbered*" — therefore even the least things in human acts are ordained by divine providence — and by reason thus: to punish and reward and to give precepts are acts of providence; but God does all these things concerning human acts; therefore human acts are subject to divine providence.

Whence it is to be said — not as the foolish Mohammed seems to say, but as the most wise Christian religion knows — that all things which are in the world are subject to divine providence, which disposes all good and bad things: good things that they may be done, bad things that they may be ordered, so that nothing inordinate may be in the kingdom of providence, and that from them some good may follow. For just as God is the best creator of good natures, so he is the most just ordinator of bad things.

Chapter XVIII — The Twelfth Error of Mohammed Refuted

Furthermore, the perfidious Mohammed asserted that circumcision is to be preserved, in which error he agreed with the Jews and certain heretics who

were called Corinthians. This error is easily refuted if we call to memory how God had promised to give a new law through Christ, other than the old law, which would be much more perfect than that; according to Jeremiah 31: "Behold the days come, says the Lord, and I will make a covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah" — that is, with the faithful confessing Christ — "*a new covenant, not according to the pact which I made with their Fathers*" — that is, according to the works of the old testament — "*but this will be the pact which after those days I will make with the house of Israel, says the Lord; I will give my law in their viscera, and I will write it in their hearts, and I will be for them in God.*"

From which authority two things are gathered: one, that God was to give a new law other than he had given to their Fathers, whence because of this — that Christ was to give a new law — it is said in Isaiah 23: "*The Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver, the Lord is our King, he himself will save us*." The second is that this new law was to be given in a different manner than the old one, for it was to be written in hearts, as the old one was written on tablets of stone — to denote the firmness or stability of the new law, and the infirmity or instability of the old.

Since therefore the new law is compared to the old as the perfect to the imperfect, it is necessary that the perfect having come, what is imperfect be evacuated, if it is ordered to the same end; for grace does not do through two what through one it can do, just as nature does not. Whence ceremonial precepts were not commanded to be kept except until the Advent of Christ the true Prophet, of whom we read in Deuteronomy 18: "*A prophet of your generation, like me, God will raise up for you from your brothers, and you shall listen to him; and it is subjoined: I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them all things which I shall prescribe to him*" — from which it is left that with Christ coming, who was there announced, according

to the disposition of that law he ought to withdraw the legal things. And Christ having come withdrew ceremonial things and instituted more powerful ones. Saint Augustine against Faustus says: "*The sacraments which were observed as announcing Christ coming — which with his advent would be completed — were taken away and other greater ones were instituted in virtue, better in utility, easier in act, fewer in number.*"[28]

Moreover for this reason, since law and priesthood go step by step, the Apostle says to the Hebrews 7 that with the priesthood being transferred it is necessary that a transference of law take place, for the law was under the administration of priests; therefore the priesthood having been changed it is necessary that the law be changed. And the reason for this is according to Saint Thomas: because with the end having changed, it is necessary that those things which are ordered to the end be changed. Every law moreover is ordered to the governance and ruling of human conversation. Whence according to the Philosopher in Book 3 of the Politics, with the conversation having changed it is necessary that the law change. [29] As however human law is ordered to worldly governance, so the spiritual and divine law to the divine governance; this governance moreover is designated by the Priesthood; it was necessary that the law be transferred; and thus ceremonial precepts ought to have ceased after the Advent of Christ the new Legislator. Whence Augustine above the passage of Judith says — her husband was Manasses — says: with Christ coming, and the Sun of the Gospel brightening in the world, all that observance ceases, and as it were a vile harvest collection passes.

Since moreover Circumcision is not a moral precept — it is not from the dictation of natural reason, as is evident — whence it was not given to every nation — it was imperfect with respect to Baptism given in the new law, and this in three ways. First indeed regarding signification, because it did not so

[28] Saint Augustine; Contra Faustam, Book 19, Chapter 13
[29] Aristotle's Politics Book 3, Lec. 3

expressly signify the cleansing of the whole man from the uncleanness of original guilt as the ablution of Baptism does.

Second, Circumcision was imperfect with respect to Baptism regarding efficacy, because there was not given such abundant grace for operating and repressing the tinder of concupiscence in Circumcision as is given in Baptism.

Third, it was imperfect with respect to Baptism regarding utility, because its utility was not as common as Baptism's, since it had a determined people, a determined sex, a determined time — which does not happen in Baptism — and therefore with the time of the fullness of grace having come, circumcision ought to have ceased with Baptism instituted. Whence the faithful are not held to circumcision. Indeed, one who would be circumcised would sin most grievously, as the Apostle says in Galatians 5: "*If you be circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing*" — that is the faith of Christ — because with circumcision being a sign and bearing the type of the Passion, one who still wished to be circumcised would believe the sign still to endure, and not the thing signified to have come, and so would fall away from Christ.

It is therefore manifest that Mohammed gravely erred by saying circumcision is still to be observed. [30] Nor ought Mohammed — nor anyone else — to have been moved by what is said in Genesis 16, that circumcision was given as an eternal covenant, because "eternal" there is taken for that which has a long duration but ultimately has an end, though its end is not determined for us; or it is said that bodily circumcision is in an eternal covenant not literally but as much as pertains to its signification, which is twofold: one is spiritual circumcision, which is the amputation of all vices, of which Moses prophesied in Deuteronomy 30: "*God your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your seed, that you may love the Lord your God.*" And the Prophet Jeremiah speaks of the same in Jeremiah 4: "*Be circumcised to the Lord and remove the*

[30] Al-Bukhari 5889; Sahih Muslim 257

foreskin of your hearts, men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem." This is the spiritual circumcision which ought to remain perpetually in us, because our foreskin — that is, all vice — is to be cut off from us, so that we may be holy and immaculate in the midst of a depraved Nation.

And indeed this is truly the circumcision of the heart, signified by that carnal one — namely that we put off the old man with his acts which is corrupted according to the desires of error, and put on the new man that is Christ; according to the signification of carnal circumcision is the future glorious resurrection of our flesh, which in eternity — that is, without end — will last; then we shall most truly be circumcised, that is, stripped of all vices of carnal concupiscence and corruptions, despoiled, like unto the Angels. Nor moreover ought Mohammed to have been moved to construct his error that Christ was circumcised, because he did not do so as an example for imitation but so as not to give occasion of incredulity to the Jews, as Saint Augustine says in the Homily on Circumcision. [31]

Chapter XIX — The Thirteenth Error of Mohammed Refuted

Moreover the perfidious Mohammed, deriding Christians by reproving their veneration of images, says of them in the Quran Chapter 98 that they are idolaters, to be damned with fire in hell. [32] [33] Now this error occurred to Mohammed because he was rude and brutish, and he ought to have understood that the Christian religion — full of wisdom and illuminated by divine light and grace — does not call images gods, does not serve them as gods, does not expect from them future judgment, but venerates them for memory and recollection of the primitive ones, and honors them but not with

[31] Saint Augustine: Sermon 196A On Circumcision
[32] Sunan al-Tirmidhī 3095
[33] Al-Bayyinah 98:1-6

the service of divine worship, nor with that given to any creature — as the holy Fathers said in the seventh Synod. For as the gloss has it on Colossians 1: "No image of God ought to be worshipped except that which is what it represents" — whence it is manifestly to be understood that the use of images of God and of the Saints among Christians is not Idolatry, as the aforesaid bestial Mohammed chatters, but is a licit and religious use.

It should be noted that, as the Philosopher says in the Book: *On Memory and Recollection*, there is a twofold movement of the soul in regard to an image: one toward the image itself, according to what it is as a thing — as for example a piece of wood, or stone, or silver depicted; the other mode is movement toward the image in as much as it is an image of another. And between these two movements there is this difference: the first movement, by which one is moved toward an image as a certain thing, is other from the movement which is toward the thing whose image it is. [34]But the second, which is toward the image in as much as it is an image, is one and the same as that which is toward the thing. To the image in as much as it is a certain thing — for example wood sculpted or depicted — no reverence ought to be shown, nor honor; for thus to show some cult or reverence toward the image itself would be truly to idolatrize. But this is how the Christian religion does not venerate images; to the image however in as much as it is an image, reverence is well shown, and the same which is due to him whose image it is. And this is not idolatry, because the honor of an image does not rest in the image itself but is referred back to it — whether pertaining to the one imagined, or to the exemplar whose image it is; and thus in the image we do not venerate the stone or wood but God or the Saint whose image it is.

Whence it is not among Christians the use of adoration of images which was among the Gentiles and pagan Idolaters, for two reasons. First, because some

[34] Aristotle; On Memory and Recollection Book 1, Lecture 3

of them worshipped the images themselves, believing as certain things that some divinity resided in them on account of the responses which Demons gave from them, and other such marvellous effects. Second, because of the things for whose sake they had made the images; for they set up images to certain creatures — to the Sun, or to the Moon — placing hope of salvation in them, whence they venerated them with the veneration of Latria, and this is idolatry. But such use of adoration of images is not among the Illustrious Christian religion; for Christians adore with Latrian adoration the image of Christ, who is the true God — not because of the image itself but because of the thing whose image it is. For as we said above according to Damascene, the honor of the image is referred to the Prototype — that is, the exemplar — and Saint Augustine says: "*One who venerates such a sign divinely instituted, whose power and significance he understands, does not venerate what he sees and transits, but rather that to which all such things are to be referred*." [35]Whence it is clear that this is not idolatry as Mohammed deserves to be called; nor does it hinder the veneration of images from the Christian Religion observed, that passage of Exodus 20: "*You shall not make for yourself a graven thing, nor any likeness*" — because it is not prohibited by that precept to make any sculpture or likeness, but to make for the purpose of worshipping; whence it is subjoined: "*You shall not adore them nor worship them.*" And because as was said the same movement is toward the image and toward the thing whose image it is, thereby the adoration is prohibited of those images which the Gentiles made in veneration of their gods — that is of demons — and therefore it is commanded: "*You shall not have strange gods before me.*" Moreover it was prohibited for that time in which God had not yet assumed human nature; for then since he was altogether incorporeal and consequently non-figurable, no corporeal image could be imposed upon him, as it is said in Isaiah 40 — for as Damascene says, it is of the highest foolishness and

[35] Saint Augustine, De Doctrina Christiana Book 3

impiety to figure what is divine — and therefore it was prohibited in the old law that images be made for worshipping; and principally because they led to Idolatry, from this that the whole world insisted on idolatry. But after God became man, he can have an image by reason of his humanity assumed, and in his bodily image be adored; nor moreover ought the bestial Mohammed to have been moved to deride Christians about the veneration of images — that nothing about it is found instituted in the Gospel — because many things the Apostles handed down to be observed which are not written. For certain things, by the familiar instinct of the Holy Spirit, the Apostles delivered to the faithful to be kept, which they did not leave in writings, but in the observance of the Church, ordered by succession of the faithful; as the Apostle Paul says in 2 Thessalonians 2: "*Stand and hold the traditions, either through a word*" — that is, oral speech — "*or through an Epistle*" — that is, writing transmitted. And among these traditions is the use of images in the Church. Whence also Damascene says that Luke painted the image of Christ, which is at Rome, and of the Blessed Virgin Mary; and Christ sent his image painted to the king Abgar, as it is said in Ecclesiastical History. Moreover the use of images among the faithful was not introduced without reason; indeed very reasonably and for many reasons — first as a most suitable instruction to the simple, who are as it were taught by them as by certain books. Second, that the mystery of the Incarnation and the examples of the Saints might be more in our memory, since they are represented daily before our eyes.

Third, to excite the affect of devotion, which is more efficaciously excited from things seen than from things heard, whence Horace says: "*More slowly do things seen impel the mind when dismissed through the ears, than those things which are subjected to the faithful eyes.*" [36] And let this much suffice for the refutation of the error of Mohammed.

---

[36] Ars Poetica Verses 180-182; Horace

Chapter XX — The Fourteenth Error of Mohammed Refuted

Consequently the perfidious Mohammed gravely errs by imposing upon Christians that they also adore their Priests.[37]

"***They have taken their rabbis and priests as well as the Messiah, son of Mary, as lords besides Allah, even though they were commanded to worship none but One God. There is no god ˹worthy of worship˺ except Him. Glorified is He above what they associate ˹with Him˺!***"

This is false and mendacious, because Christians do not adore their Prelates and Priests with Latrian adoration, which belongs to God alone, but they honor and venerate them with that veneration which is called "Dulia" in the Greek language; for in another way, as the Sages say, God is commanded to be adored, and in another way — by ancient custom — superiors were said to be adored by inferiors, when by bowing the knee or inclining the head reverence was exhibited to them. To adore God however is to submit the whole mind to him through humility and devotion, and to believe him the principle and end of all good. To honor Priests and Prelates moreover the faithful are reasonably moved: both because Priests are spiritual Fathers, are Doctors, are Governors, are Rectors of others. Whence both by precept of divine law and by the doctrine of the Savior they are to be honored — it is clear by precept of the law, for it is said in Deuteronomy 5: "*Honor your carnal or spiritual father*" — since as the carnal father is the beginning in the being of nature, so Priests are by mystery the beginning in the being of grace. Whence 1 Corinthians 3: "*I begot you through the Gospel*." Also Ecclesiasticus 3 says, as if the Lord serves those who begot by work and word — the gloss says not in the womb, so that the spiritual Father is shown, most worthy of honor. Also Ecclesiasticus 4: "*Humble your soul before the priest.*"

---

[37] At-Tawbah 9:31

And from the Gospel we have this most clearly, for Christ commanding concerning obedience to be shown to Priests says in Matthew 23: "*Upon the Chair of Moses sat the Scribes and Pharisees; do whatsoever they say.*" That obedience pertains to reverence is doubted by none, for the Apostle Paul says in 1 Timothy 5: "*Let those who preside over the presbytery be counted worthy of double honor*"; and to Romans 13 he says that every soul should be subject to higher powers. Many other things could be adduced for the refutation of the present error, but since it is not necessary, we forego them.

Chapter XXI — The Fifteenth Error Refuted

Moreover the perfidious Mohammed seems to assert that anyone living rightly in any sect can be saved, unless he apostatizes from the sect of Mohammed. For he says in the chapter called "Cow" of the Quran, which is interpreted "Cow," that Jews and Christians will be saved; and in Chapter 5 of the Quran he says: "***Indeed, the believers, Jews, Sabians[1] and Christians—whoever ˹truly˺ believes in Allah and the Last Day and does good, there will be no fear for them, nor will they grieve.***"[38] This error is the most wretched and most pernicious, giving occasion to many unbelievers of remaining in their errors. For the refutation of this most wretched error, we will cite some most certain foundations, from which the falsity of the aforesaid error will appear more clearly than light.

The first is that no one can be saved unless he is just. This foundation is clear, because beatitude according to the Philosopher in book 5 of the Ethics is all virtue. Whence Wisdom 5 says: "*The just live forever; and the Lord is their reward.*" And again Psalm 36: "*The unjust will be punished, and the way of the impious will perish.*"

---

[38] Al-Ma’idah 5:69

The second foundation is that no pure man in this life is to be called just, unless he has true faith in God. This is clear from that of Hosea 2: "The just man lives by faith." And the same the Apostle commemorates in Romans 2. Hence Augustine says: where there is not sound faith, there can be no justice; therefore since the just man lives by faith, and without faith one cannot be just, it is impossible for anyone to be saved without faith. Hence the Apostle in Hebrews 11 says: "*Without faith it is impossible to please God*." For faith is the foundation of all goods; faith is the beginning of human salvation; without it no one can come to the number of the Sons of God — because without it in this age no one obtains the grace of justification, nor in the future will possess eternal life.

The third foundation is that all those to be saved must have one faith in God; thus that as there is one founder and rector God, so one truth of faith by which all believe the same about him — not different, not another, not contrary. Whence the Apostle in Ephesians 4: "*One God, one faith*" — the gloss: the same thing is believed by all the faithful; and the same Apostle says in 1 Corinthians 1: "*That you all say the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you.*"

The fourth foundation is that this faith ought to be full and integral. Whence the Apostle in Hebrews 11 says: "Let us approach with a true heart in the fullness of faith." In fullness he says, because it does not suffice to believe some articles and not others.

The fifth foundation is that this unique, integral and full faith is not found in all sects or laws by which men adhere to the world, nor is it to be found; but they vary, and the credulities of them dissonate greatly from each other on the essence of divinity, on its simplicity, on omnipotence, on providence, on the plurality of divine persons, on the mystery of the Incarnation, on beatitude, on the sacraments — as is known to those who have studied the various sects of

Infidels, and we have shown above, reprobating the various errors of the sect of Mohammed contrary to the holy faith of Christians.

From these five foundations the falsity and perniciousness of the error of Mohammed is manifestly clear — because not only is it false, but impossible according to the aforesaid foundations, that anyone in a sect or its law can be saved — since in faith, without which there is no salvation for men, which is one, and most simple, and immutable, not all agree; but in many they contradict one another as is manifest, and the Apostle in 2 Thessalonians says: "*For faith is not all men's*." Whence Tobit 2 says: "*We await that life, which God is about to give to those who have never changed their faith from him.*"

The sixth foundation is that the sole Christian faith is that one without which there is no salvation for men; for this is the Catholic faith, which unless everyone has faithfully and firmly believed, he will not be able to be saved. This moreover we will show by authorities and by reasons. By authority first it is clear from Deuteronomy 18, where Moses prophesying of Christ says: "*A prophet of your nation and of your brothers, like me, the Lord your God will raise up; you shall listen to him yourself.*"; and the faith doctrine to be given through Christ, by whom we pray to be saved. Also from that of Mark last, where Christ says to his Apostles: "Going into the whole world, preach the Gospel to every creature" — that is, to every nation of the peoples — "he who believes and is baptized will be saved; he however who does not believe will be condemned." Also John 6 says: "He who believes in me has eternal life." Also John 10 says: "*I am the door; through me if any man enters*" — namely through faith — "*he will be saved*." Also in the same: "*He who does not enter through the door, into the sheep fold*" — that is the Church — "*but ascends another way, is a thief and a robber.*" Also in John 14 Christ says: "*I am the way, truth, and life; if therefore Christ is our life, it follows that the faith, by which the just man lives, by which all who are to be saved live — sole faith is*

that of Christ." Moreover it is easy to disprove the aforesaid error by reason, if those things are called back to memory which we noted above, according to the sacred scriptures, on the necessity or fittingness of the Incarnation of the Son of God, and his Passion, for the redemption of the human race. From which most openly it is established that after the fall of Adam no one was able to be saved without the faith of the Mediator. For no one could be liberated from that sin without believing in that mediator, either himself directly, if he were an adult; or another for him, if he were a little child. And the reason for this is: since grace and truth were made through Christ, and liberation from that sin is through the merits of Christ, and the merits of Christ do not extend themselves except to those who are made his members and are coupled to him through faith. Whence just as it is now impossible for anyone to be saved, unless he is coupled to him either through faith or through the sacrament of faith; so also it was impossible before, after the fall, for anyone to arrive at salvation, who in any way did not believe in Christ the Mediator. Therefore we say "in any way" because the faith of the Mediator can be had doubly: namely implicitly, or explicitly. Explicitly, as if someone believed the Son of God would assume our humanity, to be born of a Virgin, to suffer on the Cross, to rise on the third day, etc. However to believe explicitly was not opportune or necessary for all, but for those to whom it was revealed by God, as to the most holy Fathers. To believe implicitly however is to await the future Redeemer; in what way however and how this ought to be, to believe according to what those believed, to whom it was revealed by the Lord. And this indeed was opportune for all; which is figured in Matthew 27, where it is had that when Jesus entered Jerusalem on Palm Sunday, the crowds who preceded and followed cried out saying: "*Hosanna, blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.*"; those who preceded were the most senior — that is the Patriarchs and Prophets and other Saints — who before the Advent of Christ believed in him and spoke. The followers are the Apostles and others of

the New Testament, who the same believed and preach; at diverse times indeed they were, yet in all there was one spirit of exultation. For the same is the faith of the Mediator, as Saint Augustine says, which saves us and made the ancient just ones: because as we believe Christ to have come in the flesh, so they coming they believed the same. Therefore our faith and theirs is the same; wherefore since all the just, whether before the Incarnation, or after, neither lived nor will live except from the faith of the Incarnation of Christ; indeed what is written in Acts 4 is clear: there is no other name under Heaven, in which we must be saved — and this from that time avails for saving the human race, from which it was vitiated.

From which most manifestly three conclusions are established. The first is that this faith of the Christian Religion is sound and most true, by which Christians believe that no man — whether of greater or lesser age — can be liberated from the contagion of death and the obligation of sin, which he contracted from the first nativity, except through faith of our Lord Jesus Christ. The second conclusion is that this faith is diversified — as much as pertains to the mode of believing — according to the diversity of times and states: for we, to whom so great a benefit has been shown, are more bound to believe than those who were before the advent of Christ. Then also some more explicitly, as the greater, and those to whom some spiritual revelation was made; those however who were under the law, even more explicitly than before the law, because certain sacraments were given to them, by which quasi by figure Christ was represented; but the Gentiles who were saved, it sufficed to believe God to be the remunerator, which remuneration is not except through Christ, whence they implicitly believed in the Mediator. The third conclusion is that it is most false that anyone can be saved in the sect of Mohammed; the conclusion is clear both from what has been said and from the disproval of the following error.

Chapter XXII — The Sixteenth Error Refuted

Moreover the perfidious Mohammed became so blinded by the density of errors that he is found self-contradictory in several errors; whence forgetful, mad, and delirious, Mohammed himself added to the preceding error this one completely contrary — that no one will be saved except in the law of the Saracens. Nor is it marvellous, for as Lactantius says, this is the nature of lies — that they cannot cohere; their tradition however is true which from all sides agrees and is consistent with itself, and therefore persuades, because it is supported by constant reason.

In truth from what has been said above it suffices to show the folly and temerity of this error, and but a few things need to be brought to its refutation; it is clear in the first instance that the falsity of it, since the law of Mohammed — as we showed above — contains the most extravagant things from right faith, is full of errors, full of vices, whence it is impossible that in it there be hope of anyone's salvation. Second, that most damnable error is shown thus: the Apostle in 1 Corinthians 1 says: "*We preach Christ crucified, to the Jews indeed a scandal, to the Gentiles foolishness.*" If indeed Christ crucified is a scandal to the Jews and foolishness to the Gentiles — indeed in the sect of the Saracens, who are numbered among the Gentiles — no one will be able to be saved. Third, the aforesaid error is shown most pernicious because it damns all the Saints of the Old and New Testament, who — as we declared above — all died in faith of Christ, and not in the sect of the Saracens. Fourth, the same most damnable error is shown because it asserts the universal Church to have always been in error before the sect of the Saracens arose — than which nothing more pernicious can be said — and is against that of Hosea 2: "*I will espouse you in faith even in sempiternum*"; and Ephesians 2, the Apostle says

Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the washing of water in the word of life, that he might exhibit it to himself glorious not having spot or wrinkle. And let so much suffice for the confutation of the madness of the aforesaid error.

Chapter XXIII — The Seventeenth Error Refuted

Moreover the perfidious Mohammed erred not only about divine things, but also about Angels, about which he erred multiply; of whose errors we will touch upon six only.

The first is that Angels are corporeal substances, generated from the flame of fire. Whence in the Quran Chapter 15, he says that Demons not wishing to adore man assigned as their excuse that they were of fire ignited [39], Man however of clay; and in Chapter 55 he says — that is, God — that man was made from clay, and Demons from the flame of fire. [40] Moreover he says that God created some Angels with two wings, some with three, some with four. [41]

This error, as to the first part where he says Angels are corporeal, he followed the Heretic Tertullian who said Angels were corporeal with corporeal lineaments — and it is not only against holy scripture, but also against those who reason well philosophically. Among all — intelligences or substances of Angels — are called spiritual and immaterial and incorporeal. Whence the Prophet in Psalm 146, speaking of God, says: "*He who made his Angels spirits*"; and Blessed Dionysius in the fourth chapter of the Divine Names says that prime natures are incorporeal and immaterial. And the reason for this is manifestly clear: because the operation of anything is according to the mode

[39] Al-Sad 38:76
[40] Ar-Rahman 55:14-15
[41] Al-Fatir 35:1

of its substance. Now to understand is an operation entirely immaterial, which is evident from its object, from which any act receives its species, and the reason — in this case, something is understood in as much as it is abstracted from matter, because the forms in matter are individual, which the intellect does not apprehend according to how they are in matter. Whence it is left that every intellectual substance is immaterial and consequently incorporeal.

As for the part moreover where he says Angels are made or generated from the flame of fire [42], it is manifestly clear that he raved and gravely erred.
"***Allah asked, "What prevented you from prostrating when I commanded you?" He replied, "I am better than he is: You created me from fire and him from clay.***"

For an Angel is created by God, and thus made from nothing; therefore it is not generated from the flame of fire: the consequence is clear from the preceding, because all things which are not composed from matter and form are subject to contrariety — and since generation is from contrary and from matter, it is necessary that those things be by creation, such as are intellectual substances and all celestial bodies even with prime matter — hence it is said in Genesis 1: "*In the beginning God created heaven and earth*"; and in Psalm it says: "*All his Angels praise him*," and afterwards it subjoins: "*because he said and they were made,*" etc. The third part of the aforesaid error — where he says Angels created with wings — is so foolish and clear from the refutation of the first error of its father that it is not necessary to run through all the foolishnesses of this Mohammed; since their condemnation is most notorious to all in whom something of reason flourishes.

---

[42] Al-A'raf 7:12; In Early Islam, Iblis was said to be of a tribe of angels made from a poisonous fire according to Ibn Abbas. Secondly, Jinn are separated substances because they lack a body, Aristotle calls these beings 'Separated Substances' which was the early word for 'Angels'.

Chapter XXIV — The Eighteenth Error Refuted

Moreover, the mad and delirious Mohammed, erring about Angels, says they are mortal; whence in his book of doctrine he says that God at the end of the world will kill every creature — even Angels and Archangels — and nothing living will remain except God, and then he will revive them. [43] "***The Trumpet will be blown and all those in the heavens and all those on the earth will fall dead, except those Allah wills ˹to spare˺. Then it will be blown again and they will rise up at once, looking on ˹in anticipation˺.***"

The falsity of this error is openly gathered from the refutation of the preceding error, where it was shown from the testimony of the Prophet David that Angels are of spiritual nature and consequently incorporeal and immaterial substance, and consequently incorruptible. Whence Saint Dionysius, contemporary of the holy Apostles and disciple of Paul, in chapter 4 of the Divine Names says that the substances have life undeficient from all universal corruption by death and matter and generation of the world. Moreover the aforesaid error is refuted by reason thus. Nothing is corrupted unless because its form is separated from its matter; but an Angel is not composed of matter and form; indeed it is itself the form subsisting as in the preceding chapter is clear. Therefore it is impossible that an Angel be a corruptible substance. Moreover since death has not entered the world except through sin, as the Apostle says in Romans 5: "*Just as through one man sin entered into the world, and through sin death*," the good Angels and Archangels did not sin; therefore there is no reason from which death might be attributed to them, neither according to nature nor according to justice. Moreover if all Angels are to be killed at the end of the World, the question is asked of this stupid

[43] Az-Zumar 37:68

Mohammed himself where the throne of God is sustained, which in his book of doctrine he says is sustained by eight Angels. [44] "***And the angels will be at its edges. And there will bear the Throne of your Lord above them on that Day, eight [angels].***"

Moreover since the Resurrection — according to Damascene — is the repeated resumption of what fell and was dissolved, it is not appropriate except for mortals and corruptibles and dissoluble things. But since Angels as is clear from the above are not mortal nor corruptible, it manifestly appears the falsity of the error of the aforesaid Mohammed saying that Angels will be resurrected at the end of the world. And though God could reduce even those things to nothing, yet he does not reduce them, because to reduce something to nothing does not pertain to the manifestation of grace — since more through this divine power and goodness is shown, that he conserves them in being — whence Ecclesiasticus 3 says: "*All the works which he made persevere in eternity,*" and this is especially clear of the Angels, because God so instituted any thing that he not take away from it its own property; whence it is said in John 11 gloss: "*God who is the founder of natures does not act against natures, and if he ever for the argument of faith in created things operates something supernatural — however the inanimate things such as are Angels and spiritual substances, and also material things which lack contrariety such as the celestial bodies — the natural property of them is perpetuity, because in them is no potency toward not being.*" Whence just as he does not take away from fire the natural inclination by which it tends upward, so he does not take away from the aforesaid things perpetuity, that he reduces them to nothing. Nor does it hinder what is said in Psalm: "*The works of your hands are the heavens, they will perish, etc." and that of Luke 21: "Heaven and earth will pass away.*" Because those authorities are to be

[44] Al-Haqqah 69:17

understood not that the substance perishes, but the figure — as the Apostle says in 1 Corinthians 12, and Gregory touches upon in book 17 of the Morals.

Chapter XXV — The Nineteenth Error Refuted

The third error which the perfidious Mohammed asserts concerning Angels is that the blessed Angels sin. For he says in a certain incredible vision of his — of which we touched below in chapter 4 — that when he had ascended to the seventh heaven he looked upon one Angel weeping, and inquiring the cause of the weeping, he answered: "*the faults are mine*." [45] He himself, however, prayed for him. This error emanated from the breast of a foolish and rash man. For in the first place Blessed Augustine says in the 11th book on Genesis literally that that nature which cannot sin in the holy Angels is. Moreover this we show by most clear reasons.

First, the beatitude of the Blessed consists in this, that they see God through essence — John 17: "*This is eternal life, that they know you alone God, and him whom you sent, Jesus Christ.*" Now the essence of God is the essence of goodness; whence this way an Angel is disposed toward God, as any one not seeing toward the common nature of good. It is impossible moreover that anyone wish or act unless attending to good, or what he wishes to divert from good in the measure of such: therefore a Blessed Angel cannot wish or act except attending to God; but so wishing or acting he cannot sin: therefore it is impossible that a Blessed Angel can sin.

Second, sin in the will does not happen without some ignorance of the intellect; for the will wills nothing except the true good, or apparent; because of which it is said in Proverbs 14: "*Those err who work evil.*" And the

[45] Sahih Al-Bukhari 349; Torquemada mistakes Adam for an Angel

Philosopher in Book 3 of the Ethics: "*Every bad man is ignorant*"; but the Angel who is Blessed can in no way be ignorant, since in God he sees all things which pertain to his perfection; in no way therefore can he sin.

Third, good, in as much as it is desirable of this kind, is apprehended as the optimum; this is most greatly lovable; but the Blessed Angels seeing God through essence apprehend him as the optimum: therefore they love him most greatly; but this has the nature of love, that the wills of those loving be conformable: therefore the wills of the blessed Angels are most greatly conformable to God, and consequently such wills cannot be made perverted by sinning. Moreover since Angels and especially the blessed are superior to men, and the order of divine Providence has it that the inferior be helped through the superior: great foolishness indeed, and rash is Mohammed argued to have been, saying that he prayed for the holy Angels.

Chapter XXVI — The Twentieth Error Refuted

Moreover the perfidious Mohammed, continuously involving himself in errors, asserts that the evil Angels or demons are to be saved through the Quran. In this error Mohammed followed the error of Origen — as Augustine says in Book 21 of the City of God — who said that demons at some time through divine mercy are to be liberated from punishments; which error is most clearly elicited by the testimonies of sacred scriptures, which Mohammed himself commends, and also by reason.

By authority first from Isaiah chapter last. Speaking of all the damned he says: "Their worm will not die, and their fire will not be extinguished." Also the same in Isaiah chapter 33: "*Who among you will inhabit with everlasting fires?*" Secondly, from the Gospel of Matthew 25, where it is said that Christ

will say to the evil on the day of Judgment: "*Depart cursed into eternal fire, which is prepared for the devil and his angels*." Where it is had manifestly that the Devil is to be punished eternally — that is without end. Third, this aforesaid error is disproved from Revelation 20, where it is had that the devil, who seduced them, was cast into a pool of fire and sulphur, where the beast and the false prophets will be tormented day and night in ages of ages — by which in scripture eternity is customarily signified; in which the falsity of the aforesaid error is manifestly shown. This is also shown by reason.

For which it should be noted that Origen — whom Mohammed followed in this error — posited that every will of any creature in any state can because of freedom of choice be bent to good and to bad, excepting the soul of Christ because of the union of the Word. Whence he thought that even demons at some time through free choice could return to good, and through the divine mercy of God obtain the pardon of sins; but this position is erroneous, since it is manifestly contrary to sacred scripture, as was said. Moreover the aforesaid error is refuted by reason thus: demons obstinate in evil always persevere and will persevere perpetually in their sin; therefore it is false that they will at some time be liberated. The consequence is clear, because punishment follows guilt. The antecedent is clear both from Psalm: "*The pride of those who hate you ascends*" — which is expounded of demons; both also from that of John 3: "*From the beginning the devil sins*" — which expounding Augustine in book 11 of the City of God says he always sins from the beginning of his sin; and Blessed Gregory in Book 34 of the Morals says: "*The heart of the ancient enemy, like stone, will be hardened, because it will never be softened by any purgation of conversion.*"[46]

[46] *Saint Pope Gregory The Great; Book 34 on Job's Morals*

Second thus: an Angel is intermediate between God and man; but God has free choice immovable before and after; man has movable before and after; therefore an Angel is intermediate in mode, that if it be movable before and not after; for the contrary is impossible: that it be movable after, and not before. The cause of this immovability after — or obstinacy in demons — is not to be taken from the gravity of fault; but from the condition of nature or state; this indeed is for men death; which is for Angels case, as Damascene says. Moreover it is manifest that all the mortal sins of men — whether great or small — before death are remissible; after death however they are irremissible and of perpetual permanence. For inquiring the cause of this obstinacy, it must be considered that appetitive virtue in all is proportioned to the apprehension of intellect, from which it is moved, as the mobile from the mover. Now the apprehension of the intellect of an Angel differs from the apprehension of a man in this, that the Angel apprehends immovably through the intellect — just as we immovably apprehend the first principles — whose intellect it is. Man however apprehends through reason movably, discoursing from one thing to another, having a way of proceeding to both of opposites. Whence the will of man adheres to something movably, as potent also to depart from it, and adhere to the contrary. But the will of the Angel adheres fixedly and immovably; and therefore if it be considered before adherence, it can freely adhere to this, and to the opposite in those things which it does not naturally will; but after it now adheres immovably; it is clear therefore that from the condition of the nature of angelic will it arises, that Angels persevere immovably, either in aversion, or in conversion of supernatural good. From the external part also they are immutable either to good or to bad after the first election; because then in them the state of the wayfarer is finished. Whence it does not pertain to divine wisdom that further grace be infused into demons, by which they might be recalled from the bad of the first loss, in which they immovably persevere — as Saint Thomas elegantly shows. The falsity

therefore of the aforesaid error of Mohammed is clear, and the more so in as much as more foolishly he subjoins that demons are to be saved through his Quran. "***Say, ˹O Prophet,˺ "It has been revealed to me that a group of jinn listened ˹to the Quran,˺ and said ˹to their fellow jinn˺: 'Indeed, we have heard a wondrous recitation. It leads to Right Guidance so we believed in it, and we will never associate anyone with our Lord ˹in worship˺.***"[47]

[47] *Al Jinn 72:1-2*

Chapter XXVII — The Twenty-First Error Refuted

Moreover the perfidious Mohammed asserts that God had commanded the Angels to prostrate themselves before the first man humiliating themselves before him, concerning which in Chapter 15 he says from the person of God: "*So when I have fashioned him and had a spirit of my own ˹creation˺ breathed into him, fall down in prostration to him. So the angels all prostrated together, but not Iblis who refused to prostrate with the others.*"[48]

But this error is easily refuted, both from that very law which was established by God himself — as in Deuteronomy 5 and in the Gospel of Luke 4, where it is had that God alone is to be adored — therefore it is false that God truly commanded the Angels to adore man. Secondly, since adoration is owed by reason of excellent dignity, the superior never adores the inferior, but on the contrary; and this is because superiors have eminent dignity with respect to inferiors, and not on the contrary. Since therefore Angels are superior to men in the excellence of dignity, it does not seem consonant with reason that God commanded Angels — who are superior — to adore, or venerate in this manner man. Thirdly, the aforesaid error is refuted because in holy scripture we read that men before the Incarnation adored Angels — and not on the contrary — as is clear from Abraham in Genesis 18 when he saw three and adored one. Also in Joshua 5 it is had that Joshua seeing an Angel adored him who said: "*I am the Prince of the host of the Lord*." Also even after the Incarnation, Blessed John the Evangelist wished to adore an Angel, whence he says in Revelation 23: "*I fell to adore before the feet of the Angel*"; but the Angel in order to show how greatly human nature had been exalted after the Incarnation, and how great is the glory of God in human nature, prohibited himself to be adored, even saying doubly: "*See that you not do it; I am your fellow servant, and of your brothers.*" Therefore it does not seem verisimilar

[48] *Al-Hijr 15:29-31*

that God commanded Angels to adore man, and thus it seems foolish what Mohammed says in this part.

Chapter XXVIII — The Twenty-Second Error Refuted

Moreover the perfidious Mohammed, beastly speaking of Angels, says in Chapter 2 of the Quran that God taught Adam the vocabularies of all things, which were not yet known to the Angels. "***He taught Adam the names of all things, then He presented them to the angels and said, "Tell Me the names of these, if what you say is true?***"[49]

This error, namely that Adam knew some natural things which previously were not known to the Angels, is refuted both by the authority of sacred scripture and by reason.

Scripture says in Ezekiel 28, speaking of the devil: "*You full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty*" — plainly full of wisdom from the beginning of his origin he would not have been, if he had not had knowledge of all things created by God. Moreover this among Philosophers would be considered erroneous; since as it is said in the book of causes, every intelligence is full of forms and intelligible species; therefore from the beginning of their origin they have the knowledge of all natural things.

By reason moreover the aforesaid error is refuted: both because whatever an inferior virtue can, a superior can; if therefore the intellect of the first man — who in the order of nature is below the angelic intellect — knew natural things, imposing vocabularies upon them, much more and more fully Angels knew them. Also secondly, because separate substances move the celestial bodies — as the Philosophers posit — whatever comes from the movement of

[49] *Al-Baqarah 2:31*

celestial bodies is attributed to those bodies as instruments, to the separate substances however as principal agents. They act and move moreover through the intellect, and are causing therefore what happens through the movement of celestial bodies; therefore the forms of things which are generated and corrupted are intelligibly in the separate substances. Whence Boethius in the book on the Trinity says that from forms which are without matter came the forms which are in matter. The separate substances therefore know not only separate substances, but also the species of material things. For if they know the species of generable and corruptible bodies as proper effects; much more the species of celestial bodies, as of proper instruments; much therefore more perfectly did Angels have knowledge of natural things, than the first man, and before he himself had it. Whence manifestly the falsity of the error of the aforesaid Mohammed is clear. Let these things suffice for the extirpation of the aforesaid error.

Chapter XXIX — The Twenty-Third Error Refuted

The perfidious Mohammed also erred about souls; he asserts that the soul of Adam is a portion of the soul of God. For he says thus in chapter 24 of the Quran, from the person of God: "*When I shall have fashioned man from clay, and breathed into him the same portion of soul intimately commanding the Angels,*" etc. This error is most pernicious, in which the foolish Mohammed followed the error of certain foolish Philosophers, and finally also the error of the Manicheans, who said that the rational spirit is of the substance and nature of God.

This error is manifestly confounded both by authority and also by reason. For it is said in Genesis 1: "*Let us make man to our image and likeness.*" This is not said according to the body, since God is incorporeal; therefore according

to the soul; therefore the soul of man is made — but concerning the divine essence, neither making nor change falls; therefore it cannot be said that the soul of Adam was from the portion, or of the substance of God.

Second thus: whatever is essential to God is God; therefore according to this, every man would be God according to the soul — which is foolish to say, and inconvenient and heretical.

Third, whatever is coessential to God is invariable, and impeccable; but the soul of man is variable from goodness to malice, and from truth to error, from joy to sadness; now the substance of God is immutable as the common conception of the soul teaches: therefore it is impossible that the soul of Adam be a portion or of the substance of God.

Fourth, since God is an impartible substance — the most simple as it were — nothing of his substance can be a portion; except the whole of his substance; but it is impossible that the divine substance be other than one; if therefore the soul were of the divine substance, it would follow that there would be one soul of all men — which is manifestly false, and foolish, and many other things could be argued, which are manifestly erroneous in most bright light, yea blasphemous, which follow from that error; nor ought Mohammed to have been moved to construct this foolishness by what is said in Genesis 5: "*He breathed into his face the breath of life.*" Because as Augustine says in book 7 on De Genesis ad Litteram, that authority does not compel one to posit that the soul is of the substance of God, because also man standing or breathing does not emit anything of his own substance, but from an external nature, for he emits the air which he attracted by breathing. Whence what he says — he breathed into his face — is understood that he made spirit from nothing, and this is confirmed by Isaiah 57: "*The spirit from my face will go forth, and every breath I make*," and Isaiah 42: "*This says the Lord creating the heavens,*

and extending, strengthening the earth, and giving breath to the people who are upon it, and spirit to all walking upon it."

Chapter XXX — The Twenty-Fourth Error Refuted

From the aforesaid error Mohammed fell into another error: that he says all the souls of men are produced from one soul; in this following certain ancient heretics, who are read to have been the Authors of this sort of error. But this error is judged as mad both by Philosophers and by Theologians. By both ways therefore it is shown to be reprobate and false. For the Philosopher says in book 15 on animals and in book 3 on the soul that the intellect is from outside; and in the book on the properties of the elements he says that the innate spirit of life comes by the instinct of God. This also is shown according to the authority of sacred scripture, for it says in Genesis 2: "*God created man to his own image and likeness.*" This is moreover according to the soul with respect to the image and likeness of God. Therefore all rational souls are created from nothing, and not produced from some other one soul. Secondly, from Genesis 2 it is said that the woman having been made Adam said: "*This is bone from my bones, and flesh from my flesh" — he did not say "soul from my soul.*" Third, the aforesaid error is refuted from that Psalm 37 where the Prophet says: "Who fashioned singularly the hearts of them" — for there the heart is put for the soul, because the seat of the soul according to the Philosophers is in the heart. And Isaiah 42: "*All breath I made*" — this is clear concerning the corporeal breath it is not understood; therefore of the spiritual which is the rational soul: therefore as only God breathed in the face of Adam the breath of life, so he created the soul of any man, and consequently he produced it not from another, but made it from nothing.

Moreover the aforesaid error is confounded and destroyed by reason thus: if from one soul all were produced, either that soul gives to others a part of its substance, or the whole substance; if it gives the whole substance, therefore all souls of men are one soul substantially — which is most manifestly false. If a part, this is not so, both because the soul is simple, not having part; both because it would follow that what was produced from it, the lesser it remained, than before it was, and finally would cease to be, unless something always were restored to it which was cut off from it — which all among all the wise, who know something about the nature of rational souls, are accounted deliraments. And therefore meritoriously the faith of Christians rejects and reprobates this error, which teaches and confesses that all rational souls are not produced from some other soul; but with bodies formed, they are created by God, and by creating are infused, and by being infused are produced. Moreover the production of souls God ought to have reserved for himself alone: both because of their dignity, and because of their immortality. Because of the dignity of souls: because since the rational soul is the image of God, and naturally directly borne toward God, and benefiting in him loving him with the whole heart, all its being ought immediately to have from God himself, that it might be held to love him with the whole heart; it was also fitting because of the immortality of souls: since only God is who has life in himself, and undeficient life, he alone is who can produce the principle of perpetual life. Since, therefore a corruptible thing could not be sustained in transmutable matter, and the operation of the creature is above matter in a transmutable way, it is impossible that some creature produce a rational soul; therefore God ought to reserve its production for himself. Wherefore the falsity of the error of the aforesaid Mohammed is manifest.

Chapter XXXI — The Twenty-Fifth Error Refuted

This bestial Mohammed, confusing all things in his errors, also erred about the heavens, saying the heaven was made from smoke. For he says in his book of narratives that heaven is from smoke, and smoke from the vapor of the sea, and the sea from a certain mountain which is called Caf, which girds the whole orb and sustains heaven. This error is manifestly refuted since it is against divine scripture; for it is said in Genesis 1: "*In the beginning God created heaven and earth*"; if he created, therefore he made it from nothing; and thus not from some smoke. Moreover if heaven were made from smoke it would be alterable and corruptible — which is false, since the celestial body is without contrariety; now corruption and generation are from contrary and from matter, as in book 1 of the Physics, and book 1 on Generation. Moreover if heaven were made from smoke, it would necessarily be either an element or a thing made of elements; but it is neither of these: for the Philosopher says in the book on Substances of the Orb, that heaven is neither heavy, nor light, nor hot, nor cold, nor humid, nor dry — but every element and elementated thing is in some of these qualities. Moreover what he consequently says — that a mountain sustains heaven — is so notoriously foolish, and worthy of derision, that it is not necessary to use any other testimony.

Chapter XXXII — The Twenty-Sixth Error Refuted

Moreover this foolish Mohammed asserts that the Sun and the Moon were of equal light and virtue, and that there was no difference between day and night; but one time Gabriel flew and happened to touch the Moon with his wing, which was obscured as we now see. This he sets forth in his doctrine. This error, as to all its parts, is so manifestly not only false but delirious, that it is not necessary to adduce much.

In the first part it contradicts holy scripture, which says in Genesis 1: "*God made two great luminaries — the greater luminary to rule the day, and the lesser luminary to rule the night.*" And thus it is clear it is erroneous to say that the Sun and Moon were created of equal light and virtue. In the second part it is also against holy scripture, since the above says: "*Let there be luminaries in the firmament of heaven, and let them divide the day and the night, and be in signs, and times, and days, and years*" — and thus it is clear that from the beginning of the creation of the luminaries there was a difference between day and night. As for the third part in which he says Gabriel by touching the Moon with his wing obscured it — it is thus manifestly foolish in all things, that it would be vain to bring any testimony to this.

Chapter XXXIII — The Twenty-Seventh Error Refuted

The perfidious Mohammed also erred about matrimony, conceding as licit to have several wives, as is manifestly clear through the discourse of his Quran. This most wretched error reduces human nature to the likeness of cattle and beasts. For nearly all birds make matrimony and pairs are joined. Whence this error is easily disproved and refuted, both by the testimonies of immutable sacred scriptures and by irrefragable reasons.

First there occurs that of Genesis 2: "*They shall be two in one flesh*" — in one he said, not in several. By reason also this error is refuted: because it seems to be of natural law and reason, that one man not have several wives — just as neither can one woman have several men — since this is inbuilt in the institution of man. Now natural law, as Isidore says, is what began at the origin of rational creature; but from the beginning one had one, not two, in Genesis 2: "*A man will leave father and mother, and will adhere to his wife*" — he did not say wives; and the same in Matthew 29: therefore to have

several wives, as Mohammed concedes, does not appear to be licit. Moreover according to the Philosopher in book 1 of the Physics, as woman seeks man, so matter seeks form and the base good; but according to nature, there is only one matter of one form in act, not of several; therefore it seems in some way to repugn nature, that one have several wives.

Third thus: friendship consists in a certain equality; if therefore it is not licit for a woman to have several men — because this would be against the certainty of offspring — but if it were licit for a man to have several wives, there would not be equal friendship of the wives toward the husband, and vice versa. Whence this reason is proved by experience, because among men having several wives, they are almost considered as slave women.

Fourth: intense friendship is not had toward many; as is clear from the Philosopher in book 8 of the Ethics. If therefore a wife has one man only; a man however has several wives — there would not be equal friendship from either part: therefore it will not be liberal friendship, but in some way servile.

Fifth thus: Matrimony in men, to be distinguished from beasts, ought to be ordered according to what befits good morals; but it is against good morals to have several wives; because from this follows discord in the domestic family, as is manifest by experience: therefore it is false and erroneous that it be licit for one man to have several wives. Nor ought Mohammed to have been moved by this — that in the old law, also some holy men had several wives, like Abraham, Jacob, David, and many others. First, because they did not have several for the sake of lust, but for the sake of offspring to be raised in divine worship, because then there was a small number of the faithful. Whence Augustine in the book on the good of conjugal life says: the ancient Fathers joined marriages not overcome by vice, but led by piety. Second, because they did this not by their own authority but by dispensation, which could only be made by God alone, who is the author of nature; and it was made by

inspiration, which was principally given to the Fathers and derived from the example of them to others at that time, when it was necessary for the precept of nature to be passed over, so that there might be a greater multiplication of offspring to be raised for divine worship. Now because with Christ coming, the time of the fullness of grace of Christ having come, through which the worship of God was diffused to all nations by spiritual propagation — the same reason of dispensation which was before the advent of Christ does not run, when the worship of God was multiplied and conserved by carnal multiplication. And this about the refutation of the aforesaid error.

Chapter XXXIV — The Twenty-Eighth Error Refuted

Furthermore the perfidious Mohammed concedes as licit the repudiation of a wife — as is clear in the Quran chapters 7, 8, and 64. This error is easily shown pernicious. First because it is against the doctrine of the law and divine institution; for Christ interrogated — as is had in Matthew 19 — whether it was licit for a man to dismiss his wife for any cause, responding said to them: "Have you not read that he who made men from the beginning made them male and female"; and he said: "For this reason a man will leave Father and Mother, and will adhere to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh." And it follows: "Therefore what God joined let not man separate." Where Chrysostom says in the gloss: "Not only from the mode of creation, but also from the mode of legislation, he showed that beyond nature and beyond the law it is to dismiss a wife." Beyond nature indeed, because one flesh is divided. Beyond the law moreover because God joining and approving, the wife is not dismissed.

Second, the aforesaid error is disproved because it is against the doctrine of Christ, who in the same chapter of Matthew — namely 19 — says: "I say to

you, that whoever dismisses his wife, except for fornication, and leads another, commits adultery" — because namely the bond of that dismissed with the prior man remains.

Also this error is refuted by the Apostle in 1 Corinthians 7 saying: "To those who are conjoined in matrimony, I command — not I, but God — that a wife not depart from a man; if she departs, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her man, and let the man not dismiss a wife." The Apostle says this.

Moreover the aforesaid most reprobate error is shown, because the inseparability of matrimony seems to be of the law of nature — which is thus shown. Matrimony from the intention of nature is ordered to the education of offspring, not only for a time, but for the whole life of the offspring. Whence it is of the law of nature, that parents thesaurize for children. Since therefore offspring are the common good of man and wife, it is necessary that their society remain perpetually individed, according to the dictate of natural law; and thus it is clear that the inseparability of matrimony is of the law of nature.

Second, this is shown thus: there is in men a certain natural solicitude concerning the certainty of offspring. Whence whatever things impede the certainty of offspring are against the natural instinct of the human species. If however a man could dismiss a wife, or a wife a man, and couple herself to another, the certainty of offspring would be impeded, since a woman first known, afterward would be known by another. It is therefore against the natural instinct of the human species, that a woman be separated from a man.

Third, the aforesaid error is thus refuted: between man and wife there seems to be the greatest friendship — not only in the act of carnal coupling, which makes a certain sweet friendship also among beasts, but also in the consortium of the whole domestic conversation. Whence in token of this man for the sake

of a wife will leave father and mother, as it is said in Genesis 2. It is therefore not licit, yea most inconvenient, that matrimony be dissolved. Fourth, also the aforesaid error is shown and refuted thus: it is necessary that all other things be ordered to that which is best in man. The conjunction moreover of man and woman is not only ordered according to law for the generation of offspring — as it is in other animals — but also what befits good morals, which right reason disposes, either as much as pertains to man himself, or according to what man is a part of the domestic family, or of civil society; toward which good morals pertains the individual conjunction of male and female: for thus the fidelity of one to the other will be greater, as long as they know themselves conjoined individually; there will be greater care of each in domestic matters, as long as they esteem themselves perpetually remaining in the same possession of things. The origins of discords are also taken away from this, which ought to happen if the man dismissed a wife — between him and her kinsfolk; and also stronger charity between affines is made; also the occasions of adulteries are removed, which would be given if a man dismissed a wife, or vice versa. For through this an easier way of soliciting the marriages of others would be given; and thus infinite inconveniences would follow, if according to the erroneous foolishness of Mohammed it were licit to repudiate a wife. Nor ought the perfidious Mohammed to have been moved to construct this error — that in the old law repudiation of a wife was permitted; because that was done because of the hardness of the Jews, as Christ says in Matthew 19 — because they were prone to the killing of wives; a lesser evil was therefore permitted so as to exclude a greater evil. And this about the refutation of the aforesaid error.

Chapter XXXV — The Twenty-Ninth Error Refuted

Moreover the perfidious Mohammed gravely erred by conceding as licit adultery and fornication; for with purchased and captive women he says it is licit to concubine. This is adultery, because many times the father purchased them from the son, and vice versa the son or brother from the father corrupted them, or from a brother; whence in chapter 32 of the Quran he says: "Guard chastity except with your own wives or those subject to you and observing slave women." And there is hence no complaint. For Mohammed says it was granted to him by God that he could have access to the wives of others, so as to generate virtuous men and Prophets. In which error he seems to have followed the Nicolaitan heretics.

This error of this bestial Mohammed is most clearly refuted from divine law and the holy Gospel; for it is not to be said that it is licit which is manifestly against the divine commandment. Among other precepts of divine law it is had: "*You shall not commit adultery*" — Exodus 20. Also Leviticus 20: "*If anyone shall have committed adultery with the wife of another, and shall have perpetrated adultery with the wife of his neighbor, let both die by death — the adulterer and the adulteress*." Also Deuteronomy 5: "*You shall not covet the wife of your neighbor.*" Also Tobias 4 says: "*Attend to yourself from all fornication, and besides your wife let no crime be known.*" Also this reprobate error is shown from the Gospel of Christ. In Matthew 5 Christ says to the Jews: "*You have heard that it was said to the ancients, you shall not commit adultery; and I say to you, that everyone who looks at a woman to concupisce her, has already committed adultery in his heart.*" It is also reprobated enough by the testimony of the Apostle, when he says in Ephesians 5: "*Every fornicator, or unclean person, has no part in the Kingdom of God.*"

Second, this error from hence is to be reprobated, because it seems to be against the law of nature — which is thus shown: that action is said to be against the law of nature which is not convenient to the due end, either because it is not ordered to it by the action of the agent, or because of itself it is disproportionate to that end. Now the end which nature intends from concubitus is offspring to be procreated and educated, and that this good be sought it placed delight in coitus, as Constantine says. Whoever therefore uses concubitus for the sake of the delight which is in it itself, not referring it to that end intended by nature, against nature acts. But when moreover the name of concubine expresses the conjunction by which coitus alone for itself is sought, it is clear that it is against the law of nature to have access to a concubine not conjoined to oneself in matrimony. Nor does it hinder if it be said that someone from such concubitus sometimes seeks offspring: because still it is not convenient for the good of offspring in which not only the procreation itself is understood, but also the education and instruction by which it receives nourishment and discipline from parents, in which three things parents owe to offspring according to the Philosopher in book 8 of the Ethics. But since education and instruction of offspring by parents is owed for a long time, the law of nature requires that father and mother remain for a long time to help offspring in common. This obligation moreover of remaining of the female with the male makes matrimony; therefore it is clear that meritoriously the coitus of concubines is reprobated, and the aforesaid error of Mohammed. Nor ought Mohammed to have been moved to this error — that the ancient Fathers like Abraham, Jacob, and David are read to have had concubines: because those were wives in truth; they were not however called wives, but concubines, because they were not principal — though according to truth they were conjugal. Moreover, as Saint Thomas says, the ancient Fathers by that dispensation by which they had several wives had access to

slave women with conjugal affect. Whence in them there was not the brutal liberty which the lubricious Mohammed conceded to his followers.

Chapter XXXVI — The Thirtieth Error Refuted

Moreover this bestial Mohammed seems to have erred most gravely, conceding as licit the sin against nature — of the highest impiety and crime — it is said; though the Saracens themselves palliate it with certain honest expositions. For he says to the Saracens that they not pollute themselves with Infidels, unless they believe; and of women he says: "*Your women are your tillage, use them as you will.*"

How reprobate and execrable this error is, it is not necessary to use many testimonies: because manifestly it is not only against divine commandment but against every creature capable of reason. For among other precepts of divine law it is had: "You shall not commit adultery" — Exodus 20. Also Leviticus 20: if anyone shall have committed adultery with the wife of another and perpetrated adultery with the wife of his neighbor, let both die by death. Also Deuteronomy 5: "*You shall not covet your neighbor's wife*." Also Tobias 4: "Attend to yourself from all fornication." And from the Holy Gospel of Christ, Matthew 5: "*You have heard that it was said to the ancients, you shall not commit adultery; and I say to you, that everyone who looks at a woman to concupiscence her has already committed adultery in his heart.*" It is also reprobated by the testimony of the Apostle in Ephesians 5: "*Every fornicator or unclean person has no part in the Kingdom of God.*" And from natural reason: this error is against the natural end of this act, which is procreation; and in this it surpasses all carnal vices in gravity of sin against God and nature, and is to be utterly abominated because it is notorious to all of itself. Whence the greatness of this crime is first shown sufficiently by holy scripture

in Genesis 14, where it says that the Sodomites were most wicked men; and in Genesis 18 the Lord says: "*The cry of the Sodomites has come to me.*" Where Gregory says: the novelty of such great and unheard-of wickedness produces amazement and doubt in the listener.

Second, the greatness of that crime is shown by the greatness of the vengeance taken for it. For it was one of the causes of the Flood, as Methodius says. Moreover because of this sin God rained fire and sulphur upon Sodom, as is had in Genesis 19.

Chapter XXXVII — The Thirty-First Error Refuted

Moreover the bestial Mohammed, following certain ancient fools little different from beasts, asserted that in the other life after the Resurrection there will be the use of foods, clothing, and venereal pleasures — as he often shows in his book. In this error he followed the heretics called Chiliasts, who — as Augustine recounts in book 20 of the City of God — assert that those who rise again will engage in the most immoderate foods and carnal drinks, observing no modesty or measure.

This error is easily shown to be foolish, since it most plainly contradicts the doctrine of Christ and reason. That it contradicts the doctrine of Christ is clear: for in Matthew 22, Christ being interrogated by the Sadducees about the woman who had seven husbands in succession — whose she would be in the Resurrection — responding said: "*You err, not knowing the scriptures nor the power of God. In the Resurrection they neither marry*" — that is, men will not take wives — "*nor are given in marriage*" — that is, women will not be received by men — "*because men do not rise again to a mortal life engaging in food and venereal pleasures: but they will be like the Angels*" — the gloss understands: without stain and corruption, enjoying divine vision.

Moreover this error is refuted by the most clear reasons.

First thus: the future Resurrection will be to an immortal life, as is clear; whence Isaiah 25 says: "*God will precipitate death into sempiternity." And Hosea 13, according to the translation of the Seventy: "Death is absorbed into victory.*" And Revelation 20 says: "*Death will be no more.*" And also Mohammed himself in the book of his doctrine says that after all things have died, God will kill death, and afterwards they will rise immortal and whole.

Since death will be altogether taken away, it will be necessary that those rising again be subtracted from what serves corruptible life; or what is ordered to the state of immortal life. Now it is manifest that the use of foods serves a corruptible life; for we take in food so that the corruption which could happen from consumption of natural moisture may be avoided. It is also in the present life that the more necessary use of foods is for increase — which after the Resurrection in men will not be, since all will rise in the due quantity. Similarly the conjunction of male and female serves corruptible life; for it is ordered to generation, through which what cannot be preserved perpetually in the individual is conserved in the species. But since — as was said — the life of those rising again will be incorruptible: men will be preserved the same in number; therefore it is foolish and irrational to say that in those rising again there will be the use of foods or venereal pleasures.

Second thus: the life of those rising again will be no less ordered than the present life, but more. In this life the use of foods is ordered to some end; for food is assumed so that it may be converted into the body through digestion. If therefore after the Resurrection there will be use of foods, it will be necessary that it be converted into the body. But since nothing is dissolved from the body of the one rising again — because the body will be incorruptible — it is necessary to say that all which is converted from food passes into increase; and thus it will be necessary that the bodies of those rising again be almost infinitely increased. Or it will be necessary to say that there will be there so many excretions and other filthiness: that as much is dissolved as is converted — of which both are inconvenient. Nor does it avail what Mohammed himself says in his book of doctrine: that there will be no excretion of filth there, but purification through sweat, and he gives the example of a child in the womb of its mother, who is said to be nourished and not to excrete — but this response is of no value as is clear to one examining, because the bodies of those rising again will be so incorruptible that nothing can be dissolved from

them; whence it is manifestly clear that the case is not similar between the one and the other.

Third thus: the use of venereal pleasures is ordered to generation. If therefore after the Resurrection there will be the use of venereal pleasures — unless it is in vain — it follows that then also there will be generation of men, as now. But sterility is a damage and wound of nature which cannot be in the best state of human nature, which is such as is the state after the Resurrection. It follows therefore that the procreation of offspring will be much more fruitful and multiplied there than here. But since death will not be in that life, the people will grow in infinity. And the region of that paradise is finite, and it will be necessary that other regions be created for their habitation — and not one only but even infinite, because it is impossible, whatever finite Regions there may be, to contain infinite men. If moreover someone says that in those rising again there will be the use of foods and venereal pleasures — not for the preservation and increase of the body, nor for the preservation of the species, nor for the multiplication of men, but for sole delight, which consists in these acts, so that no delight be lacking in the ultimate recompense of man, as Mohammed himself expressly says in the book of his doctrine — it is clear that this is said inconveniently, as Saint Thomas deduces in book 4 against the Gentiles: because the life of those rising again is more ordered than our present life; but in this present life it is inordinate and vicious if anyone uses foods and venereal pleasures for sole delight alone, and not for the necessity of sustaining the body or procreating offspring. And this is reasonable: for nature ordained delights in these acts so that men, alienated by labor from these necessary acts of nature, would not desist from them — which would happen unless they were provoked by delight. Therefore it is a preposterous and indecent order if those operations are performed for sole delights alone: therefore in no way will there be in those rising again, whose life is most ordered, the use of foods or venereal pleasures.

Moreover it does not hinder what has been said — nor does it avail in any way for the error of Mohammed — that Adam before sin had an immortal life and yet was able to use foods and venereal pleasures in that state, since before it was said to him: "Increase and multiply"; and again: "Of every tree that is in Paradise you shall eat." First, because another will be the immortality and incorruptibility of those rising again, and another was that which was in Adam. For those rising again will be so immortal and incorruptible that they cannot die, nor can anything from their bodies be dissolved. But Adam was thus immortal, that he could not die if he did not sin, and could die if he sinned, and his immortality could thus be preserved — not that nothing would be dissolved from his body — but that against the dissolution of natural moisture the food assumed could come to him, so that his body might not arrive at corruption through it. Nor moreover does it hinder the aforesaid things that Christ after the Resurrection is read to have eaten and drunk: because Christ after the Resurrection did not eat out of necessity but in order to demonstrate the truth of his Resurrection. Whence that food was not converted into flesh, but was dissolved into the pre-existing matter — and this cause of eating will not be in the common Resurrection.

Chapter XXXVIII — The Thirty-Second Error Refuted

The brutish Mohammed, following certain ancient fools little differing from beasts, placed felicity and beatitude in the carnal delights of foods, drink, and venereal pleasures. For through the whole Quran he was not ashamed to promise his people a carnal and most filthy happiness in the other life. First indeed the delights of bodily opulences — cup-bearers and angelic servers. Then second the preciousness of garments and the amenities of choice and

embroidered things. Third the delights of concupiscences and the enticements of women.

This error is not only reprobated by the adherents of the Christian Religion but also by the Gentile Philosophers, who knew that beatitude consists in the operations of the intellectual part. It is judged that such a voluptuous life of this kind is not of men but of cattle, as the Philosopher asserts in book 1 of the Ethics. This error, though it is sufficiently reprobated and shown foolish from the reprobation of the preceding error, nevertheless let us show it more fully by the bestiality and madness of Mohammed himself through authorities and reasons — but briefly, since the error is so manifestly foolish. That future beatitude for the observers of the divine law consists not in the use of sensual pleasures — as the bestial Mohammed foolishly asserted, following the Epicureans — but in the act of the higher intellectual part, and in respect of the most noble object, which is God — namely in the beatific vision of God himself — is clear.

By authority it is clear first: from the Prophet David in Psalm 37, saying: "*With you is the fountain of life, and in your light we shall see light*" — as if he were to say: in the light of your knowledge is life. Also Psalm 15: "*You will fill me with joy with your face*" — the gloss: that I desire nothing further when I see you face to face. Also Job 33: "*He will see his face in jubilation.*" Also Christ in John 17 says: "*This is eternal life that they know you alone true God and him whom you sent Jesus Christ.*" Also Matthew 22: "*In the Resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but will be like the Angels of God.*" That is, the beatitude of men will be similar to the beatitude of the Angels; but their beatitude consists not in corporeal pleasure but in the vision of divinity; therefore etc. Of which the Apostle says: "*We see now through a mirror, then however face to face.*" Moreover Blessed John the Evangelist says: "*When he shall appear, we shall be like him.*" And this likeness consists

in the participation of his beatitude. Moreover it is established that the beatitude of God does not consist in corporeal pleasure — because it would be wicked to think this — therefore the likeness will be regarding the vision of essence. For he himself through his own essence understands his own substance intelligibly, and this vision of divinity is the supreme happiness of men and Angels. Let one estimate who can how great, how pleasing, how concordant and indissoluble will be the union of the human creature with the Creator — the unity in which the brightness which the Creator has through the fullness of the creature will be given by participation of the fullness which he has by nature. This will be given to the creature through grace, as Richard says in book 7 on the Apocalypse.

Moreover by manifold reason the aforesaid error is refuted, and it is shown to have emanated from a bestial breast.

First thus: ultimate beatitude promised to men as a reward for holy works consists in those things which exceed every faculty of human virtue, as the Prophet Isaiah says in chapter 14: "*Eye has not seen, nor has ear heard, nor has it ascended into the heart of man, what God has prepared for those who love him*"; and the Apostle in Romans 8: "*The sufferings of this present age are not worthy to be compared with the future glory which will be revealed in us.*" But the happiness which that deceiver Mohammed promised is not in greater goods than present life has; for he promised rivers of milk and wine and honey — whence he did not promise them other liquors of a different species than present life has — and if perchance sweeter in taste and in the same mode it holds regarding flavors, since the number of their species is determined, nor can there be more, nor can there be others. And in the same mode it holds regarding all kinds of foods. Whence it is manifest that he promised them no other happiness than the carnal one which present life has, nor the same one greater and better. From which it is manifestly clear that he

basely erred in assigning future happiness so close to present life, in placing the happiness of man in corporeal goods.

Second thus: happiness is a certain proper good of man; for brutes cannot be called happy except abusively. But carnal delights are common to men and brutes; therefore Mohammed erred in placing the beatitude of man in such things — whence he seems gravely to have offended the whole of human nature, in that he equated men with brute animals, in placing no other happiness for men than even brute animals can share — which is inconvenient; for we are therefore erected to the affect of heaven alone among living things, so that we may believe our supreme good to be not on earth, not in sense, but in the highest being.

Third thus: the ultimate end is the most noble of those things which pertain to the matter; for it has the nature of the best. But carnal delights do not befit man according to that which is most noble in him — which is the intellect — but according to sense. Therefore it is an error to place the happiness of man in such delights.

Fourth thus: the supreme perfection of man cannot be in this — that he is conjoined to things inferior to himself — but in this, that he is conjoined to something higher. For the end is better than those things which are ordered to the end; but carnal delights consist in this that man according to sense is conjoined to certain things inferior to himself — namely to sensual things — therefore it is a great error to place the happiness of man in them.

Fifth thus: happiness is maximally to be placed in that by which man maximally approaches God, who is the beatifier of Angels and men. But through the aforesaid we should believe, which the Poet has described quite aptly, saying: "And while other animals look upon the earth, He gave to man a lofty face and commanded him to behold the heavens, and to raise his upright

countenance toward the stars." Those therefore, says Lactantius, renounce themselves and abdicate the name of humans — who look not upward but downward — unless perhaps they think that this very fact that we are erect has been attributed without cause to this kind of thing. Third, in this way the ultimate end is the most noble of all those things that pertain to the matter; for it has the nature of the highest good; but carnal pleasures do not suit man according to that which is most noble in him, which is the intellect, but according to the senses: Therefore it is an error to place human happiness in such pleasures. Fourth, in this way the highest perfection of man cannot consist in being joined to things inferior to himself, but in being joined to something higher. For the end is better than those things which lead to the end, but carnal pleasures consist in the fact that man, according to the senses, is joined to certain things inferior to himself, namely sensual things; therefore it is a great error to place human happiness in such things.

Fifth, in this way happiness is most properly to be placed in that by which man most closely approaches God, who is the beatifier of Angels and men, but through the aforementioned pleasures man is most greatly hindered from the closest approach to God which takes place through contemplation, which the aforesaid sensual pleasures most greatly impede, for they are certain bonds of human minds and blindfolds of the intellectual eyes, as we clearly experience. Whence if anyone believes that through an abundance of drinking and eating he can enjoy wisdom, he deceives himself: Therefore the greatest error is to place happiness in such things.

Sixth, in this way, together with those sensual delights which Mohammed proposes, either there will be spiritual delights or there will not; if so, it is manifest that they are not compatible with one another. For spiritual delights draw human nature to themselves and seize it entirely, and do not allow carnal things to be felt at the hour at which they have touched the human mind;

whence as Bernard says, just as fire and water cannot exist simultaneously, so spiritual and carnal delights in the same person are not compatible: Therefore spiritual happiness and that carnal one which Mohammed proposes cannot exist simultaneously. But if he says they alternate, that is that one is enjoyed after the other in that life, then it follows by necessity that neither will be complete, since neither is continuous.

For continuity is a part of happiness. Moreover the very experience of the senses makes it manifest that those who taste spiritual delights immediately disdain carnal ones, as Augustine says: Because when the spirit has been tasted, all flesh becomes insipid; therefore it is impossible that they should voluntarily return in the homeland from spiritual things to carnal ones. Moreover violence or deception has no place there; therefore it is impossible for those once admitted to spiritual happiness to be diverted from it even slightly or to be joined to carnal things. Therefore it is impossible to obtain both kinds of happiness alternately there; it is therefore necessarily the case that spiritual happiness is either entirely absent there, or is the only one there, that is, besides that carnal one which Mohammed proposes. Since it is not possible to exist with it, neither alternately, nor after it, nor before it. But if they say that spiritual happiness is not there, yet it is indubitably the most powerful and most noble, and the greatest part of happiness, if however there is also some other part of it; therefore from what has been said it would evidently follow that Mohammed did not establish happiness, but a part of happiness if it is to be called a part, and that the most meager and most vile part, who placed carnal things alone.

Moreover seventh, in this way where there is such voluptuous use of food and drink and sexual acts, there will necessarily be a continuous and great emptying and dissolution and transformation of human bodies, digestion, sleep, and things of this kind, such as we experience in this life: therefore

there will be a great multitude of sweating of evacuations and urination so great that finally the place of that paradise however great it might be will not be able to hold the dung and urine of men. What therefore is that paradise of Mohammed but a tavern of incessant gorging, and a brothel and wallow of perpetual filthiness and baseness for pigs? Moreover in naming other abominations and filths, which follow from those couplings of male and female. But as for what Mohammed says that the Angels will be the cup-bearers and stewards of those who believed in him and observed his law — who would not mock this, or who would not laugh that the holy Angels, abandoning that happiness which neither eye has seen nor has entered the heart of man, should make the beds for them and decorate them for performing base acts, and that they should exchange the excellence of Angelic blessedness for the service of the kitchen or the stewardship, or the service of cup-bearing, which is far more vile than to serve pigs?

Whence it is clear that this bestial man Mohammed did not know himself, that he was an animal without reason, nor did he grasp what the happiness of the homeland was. In which he showed himself plainly not only ignorant and impious, but blind and delirious and bestial. Nor ought Mohammed or anyone else to be moved to follow such an error because some authorities are found in sacred scripture, which seem to promise the use of foods after the resurrection to men, such as that passage of Isaiah 27 where it is said: The Lord of hosts shall make for all peoples on this mountain a feast of fat meats, of meats well-refined, of vintage refined, and similar things. Because these authorities are to be understood spiritually. For divine scripture proposes intelligible things under the likeness of sensible things, so that our mind may learn from those things it knows to love unknown things. For Blessed Gregory says in a certain homily: The kingdom of heaven is therefore said to be like earthly things, so that from those things which the mind knows, it may rise toward unknown things, and by the example of visible things may be rapt toward

invisible ones, and through those things which it has learned by use, as if heated by friction, may grow warm, so that through knowing what is known it may learn to love unknown things; and according to this manner, the delight which is in the contemplation of wisdom and the reception of intelligible truth through our intellect has been accustomed to be designated in sacred scripture by the use of foods, according to that of Proverbs 9: Which is said of wisdom: she mixed her wine and set her table, she sent her handmaids to call to the tower and to the walls of the City; If anyone is little, let him come to me, she spoke to the unwise: come eat my bread, and drink the wine which I have mixed for you, and in Ecclesiasticus 15 it is said: God fed him with the bread of life and the bread of life, and of the intellect, and with the water of wisdom he gave him drink. Of wisdom itself it is also said in Proverbs 3: It is a tree of life to those who take hold of it, and blessed is he who holds it. Likewise what the Lord says in Luke 22: I dispose to you, as my Father has disposed to me, that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom. This cannot be understood of bodily food or drink, but of that which is taken at the table of wisdom, of which it was spoken. Whence it is clear that the aforesaid authorities and similar ones do not compel us to say that those who rise again make use of bodily foods.

Chapter XXIX – THE THIRTY-THIRD ERROR IS REFUTED.

By scrutinizing the doctrine of the Quran, we found that there were two motives for affirming the voluptuous, carnal, and bestial happiness which it proposes.

The first is, to use his own formal words: if any pleasure were lacking in paradise, beatitude would by no means be complete.

The second is that pleasures would be in vain if the purer and better things were absent while pleasure were missing; on account of which this swine Mohammed concludes that whatever is desired and in whatever manner however they may wish, they have all things at their disposal without delay and difficulty. Thus indeed those who here had wives among the faithful will have them there, and there the rest will be concubines, and of handmaids there will be no counting. So says he.

To these motives we have decided to respond with a special chapter, lest perhaps simple people, who are sometimes accustomed to be shaken by such motives, might happen to waver from the right faith. We shall show however that such motives not only do not compel that such voluptuous happiness be placed, but proceed from the most ignorant and bestial man:

Now the first motive is easily repelled, because when the true happiness of man, which is hoped for in another life, is fitting for man according to that which is most noble in him, which is the intellect, and with respect to the most noble object, which is God himself, the pleasures that pertain to beatitude are not sensual ones, which are common to pigs, asses, and other brute animals, but spiritual ones in which we communicate with the Angels. Hence the sensual pleasures which Mohammed proposes do not pertain to the happiness of man. Indeed, nor does true happiness sustain such pleasures, but abstracts from them, as we showed above with manifest light; on account of which they will necessarily cease in another life. Therefore the word of truth is manifest which is read in Matthew 22: That in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the Angels of God in heaven. And the same is found in Luke 20, whence it is ridiculous to seek such sensible pleasures in which brute animals share with us, when the highest pleasures are expected in which we communicate with the Angels, which will consist in the vision of the first light and the taste of the highest goodness, which will be common to

us and the Angels. Hence the argument of Mohammed is manifestly and clearly weak, when he argues thus: If any pleasure were lacking in paradise, Beatitude would not be full; it is vain and weak in strength. Because as we have already said, carnal pleasures such as Mohammed himself describes do not pertain to the true happiness of man. Indeed among the rightly wise his argument very strongly militates to the contrary, arguing thus: In paradise there will be carnal pleasures and sensual delights such as Mohammed describes; therefore it follows that there will not be true nor complete beatitude there. The consequence is clear, since as we showed above with the most evident reasons, such sensual pleasures cannot simultaneously coexist with intellectual or spiritual delights. Moreover if it is true that no pleasure or sensual thing will be lacking in the future beatitude or paradise of Mohammed, since men are affected by various and diverse pleasures — some in foods, some in drinks, some in luxury, some in gambling, some in hunting, some in fishing, some in jousting, others in various other things — we would have to say that in paradise there are all kinds of foods: fowl, sheep and oxen and all the animals of the field, all kinds of spices according to the pleasure of individual men, moreover the widest rivers of wines according to the variety of tastes of individuals, apothecaries of spices and confections, brothels of the luxurious, forests full of wild beasts for hunting, many stables of horses for jousting, and consequently much dung of animals and many similar things, which can be brought against the foolish Mohammed. These things are most foolish and worthy of all derision, and he has truly described the paradise of Mohammed for his beasts, which this bestial man conceived would be his future paradise.

Moreover then it is argued secondly, namely that pleasures would be in vain if pleasure were absent; this proceeds from great ignorance and blindness: for sensual pleasures, which in the present state of misery and corruption served

as plants, brute animals, mixed bodies, in another life when men pass from the state of corruption to the state of incorruption, they will no longer...

Page 198 — John of Turrecremata

...remain, for what served for the end must cease when the end ceases. Now such things as we have said were made for sustaining the animal life of man; whence in Genesis 9 it is said: As green herbs I gave you all flesh; therefore when with Christ the animal state of life in man will no longer exist, neither plants, nor mixed bodies such as honey, milk, wine, wool, linen, nor silk garments, nor delicacies, nor feather bedrooms, which the foolish Mohammed promises to his own in that future paradise, and therefore it is no wonder if there will be no pleasures in such things since such things will not be future for him; For the happiness of the human body does not consist in them, but from the overflow of the happiness of the soul into the body itself; the body itself will be glorified, whose glorification will contain four gifts as the four parts of the glory of the bodies of the saints, which are clarity, impassibility, subtlety, and agility; and thus the whole man will exult with delight in the Lord according to that Psalm: My heart and my flesh have exulted in the living God. Moreover the difference of the sexes and the variety of members after the resurrection will not be in vain, since it is for the reintegration of human nature in species and in individual wholeness, even if animal operations are absent; although therefore men and women arise with the integrity of their members, they are not to be said...

Page 199 — On the Errors of Mohammed

...to be present in vain as women, because there will be no intercourse with them.

First, because when the human race shall then have the entire predefined multitude of men from God, no longer will the generation of men be necessary, to which the carnal intercourse of women is ordained by nature itself. Then second, because there all carnal appetite of pleasure will entirely cease; no temptation of the enemy will strike; there will be no will to sin, no faculty of speaking idly; but all joy, all exultation — men joined with the Angels — will enjoy perpetual joy without any infirmity of the flesh.

THE THIRTY-FOURTH ERROR IS REFUTED. Chapter XXXX.

Moreover the treacherous Mohammed, to the aforesaid errors, added this one: that to drink wine was the greatest sin, which is not a little to be wondered at.

In the first place, because the reason of this wine was so lacking, that he promised rivers of wine in another immortal and incorruptible life for those who observe his law, where the use of wines has no place; and in this mortal life he said the use of wine...

Page 200 — John of Turrecremata

...to be a sin, and what is more deserving of derision: to show the reasonableness of the prohibition of the use of wine, he narrates and indeed feigns in the book which is called "Of the Doctrine of Mohammed" a certain foolish story, namely that two Angels, namely Arot and Marot, were once sent by God from heaven to earth for governing and instructing the human race, to whom three things were forbidden by God. The first is that they should not

kill anyone. The second is that they should not judge unjustly. The third, that they should not drink wine. And after much time had passed while these were known as judges throughout the whole world, there came to them on a certain day a woman surpassing all women in beauty, having a case against her husband, who — in order to accommodate the judges to her side — invited them to dinner. Subsequently she, endeavoring to please those at table, also placed cups of wine before them while ministering; she offers frequently, urges that they take them. What more? The charms of the woman overcame them; inebriated by the cups, they pressed in upon the beautiful hostess, conquered, they demanded to lie with her; she agrees on condition that while one taught the word by which he ascended to the heavens the other taught that by which they descended. She liked the condition; when therefore she had learned it, she was suddenly raised and ascended to the heavens. Which, when God saw, having examined the case, He placed her as Lucifer, most beautiful among the stars, so that she might be among women. But those being called to judgment...

Page 201 — On the Errors of Mohammed

...called, God proposed to them that they choose between the punishment of this age and the punishment of another; and they chose this one. Having been found guilty therefore they are bound with iron chains, with their heads divided, in a well called Bebil, until the day of judgment.

It is plainly astonishing how great was the madness of this beast Mohammed and the darkness of mind of those who gave faith to him in such stupidities, that he should describe the holy Angels of God as such, that they could be inebriated and mixed with women — things which are absurd to all men in whom any spark of reason resides. For since Angels are not animals but, as we

showed in the above parts, incorporeal substances and intellectual natures, it is not natural for them to be inebriated or to be mixed with women, for this is fitting only for animals.

Moreover, even though sometimes by the command of the omnipotent God, for some mystery concerning men to be performed, it may happen that they assume bodies, yet in those bodies they do not exercise — nor can they exercise — the operations of life. Whence in Tobias 12 the Angel Raphael said: When I was with you I seemed to eat and drink certain things, but I use invisible nourishment and food. Therefore so great is both the ignorance and the foolishness of Mohammed himself.

These things then being dismissed, we say against the aforementioned error that to drink wine is not a...

Page 202 — John of Turrecremata

...sin, but to be made drunk with wine is regularly a sin, as the Apostle says in Ephesians 5: Be not drunk with wine, in which is luxury.

What therefore Mohammed erred in saying that to drink wine is the greatest sin, we shall demonstrate from three sources from which we shall make manifest the falseness of his error.

First by the testimony of the sacred scriptures, which he himself accepts.

Second by reasons.

Third from the holiness of those who have used wine.

The aforesaid error is refuted in the first place from that text of Deuteronomy 14, where God speaking of the provision to be made on the way says: Buy

from the same money whatever pleases you, wine also and strong drink, and all that your soul desires, and you shall eat before the Lord your God etc. Also Ecclesiasticus 31: Wine drunk in sobriety is life equal to men. Also in the same place: exultation of the soul and of the heart is wine drunk moderately. Second the same is argued by reasons. First in this way: no food or drink considered in itself is illicit. This is clear from the sentence of Our Lord the Savior in Matthew 15: Nothing that enters the mouth defiles a man, namely spiritually. Therefore to drink wine is not a sin, and consequently not a great one.

Third in this way the Lord God says through his Apostle in 1 Timothy 4: Every creature of God is good and nothing is to be rejected, which with...

Page 203 — On the Errors of Mohammed

...thanksgiving is received; and in Romans 14 it is said that all things are clean, therefore to drink wine is not a sin.

By reason second the falseness of the aforesaid error appears. First because if to drink wine were a sin, as the foolish Mohammed asserted, Christ would never have been present at those nuptials, at which it is read that he was present in John 2, and honored them by changing water into wine.

Second the same falseness is demonstrated more clearly, because if to drink wine were a sin, Christ would never have assumed wine as the matter of the Eucharistic Sacrament, which however he did in Matthew 26.

Third if to drink wine had been a sin, the Apostle, the vessel of election and of truth, would never have commanded Timothy to use wine on account of his stomach and his frequent infirmities.

Third the falseness of the aforesaid error is principally shown from the holiness of those who have used wine — who are read from the time indeed of Noah, who is first read to have drunk wine in Genesis 19. The Holy Fathers drank wine; whence concerning Isaac it is clearly read in Genesis 27; concerning Christ it is most clearly testified in Scripture in Matthew 6 and Matthew 20; and concerning the Apostles the same. Nor does this hinder the aforesaid truth, that in certain scriptures the use of wine is sometimes seen to be prohibited, since the prohibition is understood as made only for priests...

Page 204 — John of Turrecremata

...and this for the time when they were entering upon the service of the tabernacle and altar in the ancient law, as in Leviticus 10 it is commanded to the high priest Aaron: You and your son shall not drink wine and everything that can make one drunk, since you shall enter the tabernacle of testimony. Or if the prohibition is made for all, it is to be understood not of the simple use of wine, but of immoderate use of wine, according to that of Ecclesiastes 2: I thought to withdraw my flesh from wine, that I might transfer my soul to wisdom.

But here it is not to be passed over that Mohammed did not introduce abstinence from wine for the desire of wisdom or for the love of holiness, but craftily he made abstinence from wine for the preservation of the peace of the Republic, about which they carefully attended; for when in a hot region wine is very strong, if the Saracens were to be served with strong wine — since without it they are not sober daily — they would be drunk and more devoted to pleasure, and would mutually kill each other; for as is said in Ecclesiasticus 19: Wine and women cause even the wise to apostatize. And in 31: Wine has destroyed many. Fire tests iron with hardness; so wine will argue the hearts of

the proud in a drunken state; on account of which Mohammed as a Legislator of the Saracens prohibited wine.

Page 205 — On the Errors of Mohammed

Second he prohibited it, because he himself like other Tyrants feared that the peoples subject to him might rise up tumultuously against him, and because through wine quarrels were accustomed to arise and many scandals of disturbances, especially among brutal men, as were the peoples of those regions. Therefore to guard against such things, craftily rather than from love of Religion, he prohibited the use of wine.

THE THIRTY-FOURTH ERROR OF Mohammed IS REFUTED. Chapter XXXXI.

Among other foolish errors of Mohammed, it is found that he asserted that all created things of heaven and of earth, and birds, invoke God, and know one and only one way and manner of praying.

This error is foolish and easily refuted. For since prayer is an assent of the mind toward God, and thus a part of contemplation, it is manifest that it is an error to attribute prayer to things of the senses and devoid of reason. Nor does it support the aforesaid error that in the last Psalm all creatures are invited to the praise of God; because not therefore, as the Wise interpreters of the divine scriptures say, do those inanimate higher creatures such as the Sun, Moon, and stars...

...or inferior ones lacking senses or reason, praise God with heart or mouth; since they lack reason; but they are said to praise — the Sun, and the heavens, and the Moon — God, insofar as by their own beauty and virtue they lead men to the knowledge and praise of God himself. But other inferior creatures are also said to praise God insofar as in themselves the divine goodness shines back, and they are the matter of divine praise to intellectual creatures, just as it is commonly said that a man is praised for his riches. Whence Isidorus: intelligible things praise God through themselves; irrational and sensible things, not through themselves, but through us, while we considering them praise God.

THE THIRTY-SIXTH ERROR IS REFUTED. Chapter XXXII.

Moreover the treacherous Mohammed, impure and carnal, also brought forward certain false, erroneous, and delirious things against the Blessed Virgin in his Quran, Chapter 33. Thus speaking about the Blessed Virgin: It has been firmly and constantly adjudged that she, being pregnant, fled to a distant place where there were palms; and at last the birth, preceded by a menstrual flow, while she stood beside the palm tree, she said: ***"Alas! I wish I had died before this, and was a thing long forgotten!";*** but Christ going forth from below her, consoling her himself, said: "***Do not grieve! Your Lord has provided a stream at your feet.***" Then God addressed her himself, that she should shake the palm tree, and so fresh palm shoots should fall upon her, and hence eating and drinking she should strengthen and comfort her heart, and mitigate it. [50]In these things indeed which this fool says against the honor of

[50] Surah Al-Maryam 19:23-25

the Most Blessed Virgin, there seem to be contained as many errors as there are words.

For what he first says — that the Blessed Virgin, having conceived a son, fled to a distant place where there were palms — is manifestly erroneous; since sacred scripture contradicts it. For it is read in Luke 1 that after the conception of the child and after the Angel departed, she went into the hill country with haste into a city of Judah, and entered the house of Zachary, and saluted Elizabeth, whom she knew would be bearing the forerunner and precursor of the Lord. But she is said to have gone into the hill country, not into a wooded and solitary place, as Mohammed lies; but because the place where Zacharias dwelt was higher than Galilee, from which the Blessed Virgin departed; she is said moreover to have stayed with Elizabeth about three months, for whose consolation and service she had come; and when the birth of Blessed John was complete she returned to her own house.

What he says second — that the menstrual flow preceded the birth and had distilled from the Blessed Virgin — is foolish, since pregnant women, as physicians commonly say, do not menstruate; for Hippocrates says that if a woman while pregnant menstruates, the fetus is not healthy [51], which in the case of the Blessed Virgin with the child conceived seems a blasphemy. For the Most Blessed Virgin conceived not from male seed but from a mystical breathing of the Spirit, and gave birth without any corruption or pain. For the Virgin before birth, Virgin in birth, Virgin after birth, always immaculate, always intact, always splendid, and most pure remained. Whence Isaiah 7: Behold the Virgin shall conceive and bear a son.

Now what he says third — that the Blessed Virgin seeing that distillation of menstrual blood said: Would that I had succumbed to death and oblivion — is most false and very erroneous. First because, as we said above, such

[51] *Hippocrates; Aphorisms 5.60*

menstrual flow after conception before birth did not happen to her. Second because, given that some similar distillation of menstrual blood had occurred in her, which happens to other women and even holy Virgins each month, it is not to be believed that the Most Blessed Virgin said those words of desperation, that she would have preferred to die, rather than endure such a natural flow; since such a purging of nature is wont to happen without sin. Third because the birth of the Virgin did not approach, nor was any impurity or pain present; but the greatest joyfulness was present, according to that of Isaiah 35.

Chapter XXXXIII – THE THIRTY-SEVENTH ERROR IS REFUTED

Moreover the aforesaid treacherous Mohammed, in a fourth place, says that the Blessed Virgin, being in the aforesaid wooded place, afflicted with sorrow, Christ going forth from below her consoling her said: *"**Do not grieve! Your Lord has provided a stream at your feet.***" This error has manifested falseness.

First because it is against sacred scripture, in that he says the Virgin gave birth in a distant and wooded place; whereas Christ was born in Bethlehem, as the testimony of the Prophet makes clear in Micah 5: Where it is said, You Bethlehem Ephrata: for from you shall come forth he who is to be the ruler in Israel; and from the Gospel of Matthew 2: When Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judah.

Then second it has the most manifest falseness, where he says that the infant going forth from beneath her addressed the Blessed Virgin contrary to the usual manner of other children — which could only have happened miraculously — especially since Chrysostom says that the Magi found the infant Jesus with a small quantity of alien help, feeble and unable to speak,

and in no way distinguished from the general condition of human infancy.[52] He also says above John that Christ did not perform miracles before he had converted water into wine, on account of which it is said in John 2: This he made the beginning of his signs.

THE THIRTY-EIGHTH ERROR IS REFUTED. Chapter XXXXIV.

Consequently the treacherous Mohammed also erred against the honor of the Most Blessed Virgin where he says that the Lord addressed her and commanded her to shake the palm tree, and so fresh shoots fell upon her; hence eating and drinking she should strengthen her heart, and mitigate it.

This error contains manifest falseness. First because in the place where Christ was born there were no palms. For he was born in a manger. Then second, because the Blessed Virgin suffered no pain or labor or sorrow in the birth, which would have given cause for that consolation and refreshment of those fresh palm shoots through food for her; such indeed bodily consolation through food is given to women who bring forth with corruption and pain, of which kind was not the Most Blessed Virgin, as has been often repeated.

[52] *Saint John Chrysostom: Homily 8 on Matthew*

Chapter XLV – THE THIRTY-NINTH ERROR IS REFUTED

Moreover the aforesaid treacherous Mohammed in the preceding chapter subjoins another error; for he says that Mary, presenting her child, was being reproached not a little by those saying: O Mary, when neither of your parents was the worse, why have you committed so evil a deed? But the Virgin showing the child, was indicating with signs that they themselves should address the infant; in what way suited those asking such things, he himself first breaking into speech said: I am the servant of God, who giving me a book has established me as a Prophet. All those things are frivolous and false.

First of all it is false that in the aforesaid manner certain ones were insulting the Most Blessed Virgin, reproaching her as if she had conceived in adultery. Whence to exclude this, the Virgin Mary was betrothed; whence in Luke 1: The Angel Gabriel was sent, etc. He says to the Virgin Mary who was betrothed, etc. Where Ambrose says: why moreover before she was betrothed was it not fulfilled, perhaps lest it be said that she had conceived in adultery etc. And since it was common among all that she was betrothed to...

Page 212 — John of Turrecremata

...Joseph, Joseph was commonly called the Father of Christ. Whence in Luke 2 it is said: And the Father and Mother were marveling at those things which were said etc. Where Gloss 1 says: Joseph, who was betrothed so as to preserve the reputation of Mary, is her foster father. Also Luke 2 says: Blessed Virgin, Son Christ, what have you done to us? I and your Father sorrowful seek you. Whence it is most false that such a wicked presumption would have been held about the Blessed Virgin. Moreover what he says — that Jesus

spoke to those reproaching his mother — from what has been said it is clear to be false and fabulous.

THE FORTIETH ERROR IS REFUTED. Chapter XXXXVI.

Moreover the malicious Mohammed, in order to more easily lead simple people to himself, as we read in a certain book, read Prophets and ancient Fathers, as for instance Noah, Abraham, Isaac, the sons of these as...

Page 213 — On the Errors of Mohammed

...the Saracens, and not only are these things said of the holy Fathers of the Old Testament, but also of the Apostles of Christ, who were most outstanding in the new testament, and who protested to Christ that they were Saracens.

But speaking of Noah, he says: Therefore the flood came into the world, because he himself was preaching to men that they would become Saracens and they refused.

This error is so manifestly not only false but wicked that it is not necessary to bring in witnesses. For how could those holy Fathers and Prophets be Saracens who preceded Mohammed and his sect by more than two thousand years? How could the holy Prophets be Saracens, who in all their Prophecies announced and prophesied concerning Christ our Savior, which things the perfidious Mohammed himself denies and condemns?

Moreover that Noah would have preached to men that they would become Saracens contains manifest falseness: both for the above-mentioned reason, and because since Noah by the testimony of the Lord was a just and perfect

man, he would not have exhorted anyone to a sect so damnable, and deprived of all virtue, and full of all crimes; such was the sect of Mohammed.

But what he says, that the flood came into the world because men refused to be Saracens, is worthy of laughter and derision among all...

Page 214 — John of Turrecremata

...as is evident from what has been said: Indeed the flood came into the world because men were following the way of corruption and carnality, which the Saracens afterward followed. Whence in Genesis 6 it is thus said: And when God had seen that the earth was corrupted, for all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth, he said to Noah: The end of all flesh has come before me, the earth is filled with iniquity from their face, and I will destroy them with the earth. But what he consequently says concerning the Apostles, the falseness is manifest from the above reasons. First because the Apostles preceded Mohammed by many hundreds of years, he who says himself to be the first of the Saracens. Then second, because the very doctrine of the Apostles is completely contrary to the doctrine of Mohammed, as is most clear to those inspecting the foundations of the faith ordained by the Apostles themselves, and the doctrine of Mohammed from the other part. For Mohammed denies the trinity of persons in the Divine; the Apostles confess it. He denies God the Father to have a son; those most clearly confess it. This treacherous one denies Christ to be God. Those confess him to be the natural, consubstantial Son of God equal to the Father. He denies Christ to be dead; those for the redemption of the human race profess him crucified, dead, and buried; and so concerning the rest. Whence manifest is the falseness and the fool-...

Page 215 — On the Errors of Mohammed

...ishness in this part of the treacherous Mohammed. And this concerning the refutation of the present error.

THE FORTY-FIRST ERROR IS REFUTED. Chapter XXXXVIII.

Furthermore the treacherous Mohammed, erring most gravely above all things, as a blasphemer is convicted: that all things false, all things erroneous, all things most abominable, all things foolish and impious, which in his Quran he teaches, or commands, or promises to those who will observe his law in the future, he imposes upon God as one teaching, or as one commanding, or as one revealing, or as one promising.

This error is the most wicked. First from the genus of sin, because it is a sin of blasphemy, which is greater than all other sin. This is clear thus: the sin of blasphemy seems to import a certain derogation of some outstanding excellence of goodness, and especially of divine goodness. But God, as Dionysius says in the first chapter on the Divine Names, is goodness itself; whence whatever suits God pertains to goodness itself, and whatever does not pertain to him is far from the nature of perfect goodness, which is his essence; therefore whoever denies something from God which suits him, or asserts of God what...

Page 216 — John of Turrecremata

...does not suit him, derogates from divine goodness. Now since Mohammed denies many things from God which suit him — such as the Trinity of persons, eternal generation, the procession of the Holy Spirit, the Divinity of

Christ, the saving death of Christ, judicial authority in Christ, and many others as we showed above going through his many errors — he asserts moreover of God many things which in no way suit him: such as that from God, who is the highest truth, the lies and errors which he himself taught in his Quran proceeded. Also he asserts of God, who is the highest goodness and highest holiness, that from him those impious and foolish precepts went out which he himself commands and grants to his Saracens. Also he asserts of God, who is the source of the fullness of every good, that he does not fully reward his servants, since he asserts that he will not give them other happiness except sensual and carnal, which is also common to brute animals, whereby it is manifest that he stood as a blasphemer by derogating from the excellence of divine goodness in those things which have been said through him, which we above showed to be most false, erroneous, and blasphemous. Moreover this error of Mohammed is the worst, since the origin and root of all his evils is his, as through whom in subjection to him he drew almost infinite nations; for indeed faith...

Page 217 — On the Errors of Mohammed

...is given to his errors through simple and ignorant men as if from the mouth and authority of God speaking; concerning which it is most to be understood what is said of false Prophets by God in Jeremiah 23, saying: Do not listen to the words of the Prophets, who prophesy to you and deceive you; they speak the vision of their own heart; they speak not from the mouth of the Lord. And below: I did not send the Prophets, and they ran; I did not speak to them, and they prophesied. And below: I heard the Lord says, what the Prophets have said prophesying in my name falsely. And let these things suffice for repelling and condemning the aforesaid error.

TWELVE PREROGATIVES OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH BY WHICH IT IS DISTINGUISHED FROM THE SECT OF Mohammed, ON ACCOUNT OF WHICH ALL THOSE USING REASON OUGHT TO LEAVE ALL OTHER SECTS AND FLY TO THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. Chapter XXXXVIII.

From the above, well considered, we can gather twelve excellences or prerogatives of dignity by which the law of the Christians is distinguished from the sect of Mohammed, on account of which the Saracens and all other infidels, if they desire true beatitude, leaving every other sect, should swiftly run to the faith of Christ and be incorporated into it.

First the Christian faith excels because it has an origin of the highest nobility.

Second it has a Teacher and Doctor of the highest holiness.

Third it has signs confirming divine power.

Fourth it has witnesses of the greatest authority.

Fifth it has documents of irrefragable truth.

Sixth it has precepts of complete honesty.

Seventh it has counsels of perfect sublimity.

Eighth it has prohibitions of all enormity.

Ninth it has sacraments of pure virtuousness.

Tenth the Christian faith excels because it was introduced not by violence of arms or tyrannical power, but by humility and patience and greatness.

Eleventh it has an existence of incorruptible firmness.

Twelfth it has promises of ineffable happiness.

We shall demonstrate each briefly, but since in...

Page 218 — John of Turrecremata

...the above things many of them have been digested. The Christian faith has in the first place an origin of the highest nobility, because it has not been brought by men, nor by chance or fortune, but proceeded from the mouth of God. Isaiah 33: God is our Judge, God is our Lawgiver, God is our King, he himself will come, etc. And in Matthew 5 it is said: Opening his mouth he taught them; concerning which Augustine says: He opened his own mouth. Whence Mohammed also professes this in several places, saying the Gospel was given by God to Christ. Whence from the person of God he says it was said through Christ: O Christ, recall how I gave you the spirit so that you might speak to men, and I taught you the book and wisdom, and the law of Moses and the Gospel. But the law or sect of Mohammed does not have a heavenly origin, but an earthly one; not divine but diabolical, as we clearly showed in chapter 3.

Second the evangelical law or that of the Christians has a Teacher and Doctor of the highest holiness and grace above the sons of men. And below: God your Lord has anointed you with the oil of gladness — that is, the grace of holiness — above your companions. Whence in Daniel 9 he is called the Holy of holies. Whence also Mohammed says of him that he was the best man, wise, conceived of the Holy Spirit, the Word and virtue of God. But such was not the Teacher and Doctor of the Saracenic sect, namely Mohammed, who not only...

Page 219 — On the Errors of Mohammed

...not holy, but most villainous, an idolater, a homicide, a robber, most lubricous, as we showed in the beginning of this treatise.

Third the law of the Christians excels in this that it has signs confirming divine power; which indeed could only be done by the power of God alone — such as the resurrection of the dead, the curing of lepers, the illumination of the blind, and such things which innumerable were done by Christ and his disciples in his name, and continue throughout the world. Whence of Christ it is said in Luke 6: Virtue went out from him and healed all, since every kind of miracle was done by him. In Matthew 11: The blind see, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them. About the signs moreover which are done in his name and faith by others it is said: Mark last chapter: Signs moreover shall follow those who believe: in my name they shall cast out demons, they shall speak in new tongues, they shall take away serpents, and if they drink something deadly it shall not harm them. Moreover not only the dead saints of this Christian faith confirmed the truth of miracles, but also the living daily testify the truth of those signs throughout the world by the virtue of signs. But the sect of Mohammed has no such signs; no such miracles performed by Mohammed nor by his...

Page 220 — On the Errors of Mohammed

...followers are confirmed, nor was it shown to be from God; whence he himself confesses that signs were not given to him, but that he came in the power of arms, as we showed in chapter 4.

Fourth the law of the Christians excels in this that it has witnesses of the greatest authority. It has indeed the holy Prophets of the Old Testament. Whence Christ says in John 5: Search the Scriptures; they themselves bear testimony of me. Whence the scripture of the Old Testament bears testimony of Christ, determining the time of his coming. Genesis last: The scepter shall not be taken from Judah, nor a leader from his thigh until he comes who is to be sent, and he is the expectation of the nations. Also the Scripture testifies of him in Daniel 9, determining the coming of the holy of holies under a certain fixed number of weeks. Also it testifies of Christ determining the place of his birth. Micah 5: And you Bethlehem Ephrata: for from you shall come forth he who is to be ruler in Israel. Also concerning Christ it testifies determining the manner of being born: Isaiah 7: Behold a Virgin shall conceive and bear a son and his name shall be called Emmanuel, which is interpreted God with us. Also sacred ancient scripture testifies...

Page 221 — John of Turrecremata

...of him determining in him the majesty of his divinity: Isaiah 9: A child is born to us and a son is given to us; and following: his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, mighty God, etc. Also the sacred scripture of antiquity testifies of him determining the manner of his conversion in poverty and humility: Zechariah 9: Behold your King comes to you just and your Savior, and he himself is poor. Also it provides testimony of him determining the manner of dying in Isaiah 53: Like a sheep he shall be led to the slaughter, etc. Briefly all the mysteries of Christ which the Catholic faith proposes to be believed concerning him, from the Old Testament has the clearest and most brilliant testimonies. Moreover, the witnesses of the greatest authority, with no exception greater, the Christian faith has from the New Testament.

It has in the first place John the Baptist, than whom a greater has not risen among those born of women, as a witness of Christ. Whose holiness also Mohammed commends most highly in the Quran, chapter 3. This John bears testimony of Christ: John says, This is he of whom I said, he who is to come after me was made before me, who is before me in dignity, and from his fullness we have all received grace for grace; and below: Of whom I am not worthy to loose the strap of his sandal; and below: Behold the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world.

Moreover the Christian faith has as testimony of its truth all the holy Apostles, who with the Holy Spirit suggesting it, gave out the symbol of the faith itself, to whom the Lord said: And you shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem, and in all Ju-...

Page 222 — John of Turrecremata

...-dea, and Samaria, unto the utmost parts of the earth. Acts 1.

Furthermore the Christian faith has witnesses even those who were considered greatest among philosophers, as Augustine narrates about Plato from the City of God, book 8 and 10. Also as Lactantius narrates about the predictions of the Sibyls, book 4 chapter 6. Of whom also Augustine speaks in the City of God, and in the sermon on the Nativity of the Lord.

But the sect of Mohammed has nothing, since it is true and commanded by God — no truthful witness, no Prophets, no Apostles, no holy men whatsoever, as is manifest, since there is no such one to be found in the whole Quran, nor in the book which is said to be of his doctrine.

If however the Saracens say they have them, though they are not introduced there, let them produce them, and let us see who they are and where they are from, and what is their authority, what holiness, what dignity, what wisdom; and they shall be heard freely.

Fifth the law of the Christians excels in this that it has documents of irrefragable truth. Psalm 118: The beginning of your words is truth; your judgments endure forever. A singular testimony of irrefragable truth of the law of Christ is given by Mohammed in the chapter on Jonah, thus saying to his own Saracens: If in any doubt about the Quran...

Page 223 — On the Errors of Mohammed

...they are, let them ask those who before them received the books, namely from Christians and Jews. The sect of Mohammed does not have irrefragable truth, but is full of many errors, many crimes, and blasphemies, as we showed above in chapter 4.

Sixth the law of the Christians excels because it has commands and precepts of complete honesty, full of the splendors of virtues; for it teaches sobriety and justice, prudence and virtue, than which nothing is more useful in the life of men. Wisdom 7: especially since it leads men to the love of God and of neighbor, in which two the law and the prophets depend. Hence the Prophet says in Psalm 118: Blessed are the immaculate in the way, who walk in the law of the Lord. But the sect of Mohammed commands base and most filthy things, as we sufficiently showed above in chapter 4. And Mohammed is properly figured in the Revelation of Blessed John through the beast and the prostitute.

Seventh the law of the Christians excels because it has counsels of perfect sublimity of perfection; for it commands charity toward enemies, kindness and benignity toward those who hate, true aid to those who curse, patience toward those who persecute, food to the hungry, and promises the grace of reward. Matthew 5: Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, pray for those who perse-...

Page 224 — On the Errors of Mohammed

...-cute you and calumniate you, that you may be the children of your Father who is in heaven.

It also has counsels of evangelical perfection, about which it says in Matthew 19: If you wish to be perfect, go and sell all that you have, and give to the poor, and you shall have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me.

But the sect of Mohammed has no such counsels of perfection, but iniquitous and impious ones, which robbers and tyrants have — such as homicides, violence, plunder, vengeance. Whence Mohammed says no one need repent except he who has received vengeance for the injury inflicted upon himself. He commands those not receiving his law to be captured and killed, and such things.

Eighth the law of the Christians excels because it has prohibitions of all enormity; it permits no evil whatsoever as the most perfect, but excludes all things and predicts they are to be punished; on account of which Christ the lawgiver says in Matthew 12: But I say to you that for every idle word which men shall have spoken upon earth they shall render an account on the day of judgment. But if for every idle word, how much more for a harmful one; and if for a word, how much more for a deed. So great indeed is the power of the

law of Christ, and of the wisdom delivered to us, that when transfused into the breast of man it expels the mother of all crimes, foolishness, in one single moment. But the sect of Mohammed is not of such...

Page 225 — On the Errors of Mohammed

...a kind, as we showed above in chapter 4: it permits and grants many iniquitous and impious things; even though Mohammed sometimes prohibits certain sins — such as robbery, or perjury, or fornication, or certain other evils — yet the prohibition itself is a kind of permission; for he says: do not do such things, because they do not please God, but if you have done them, he is merciful and compassionate and will easily pardon you. Such easy forgiveness of indulgence is equivalent to a permission of crimes, because as Gregory testifies, the ease of pardon gives incentive to the desire for sinning.

Ninth the law of the Christians excels because it has sacraments of excellent virtuousness as a remedy and medicine of defects and wounds of sins. It has among other things the sacrament of Baptism, in which the soul is washed and purged from the filth of original sin and actual, if it happens to be present at the same time; About which Ezekiel 36: I will pour out upon you clean water, and you shall be cleansed from all your defilements. It also has the sacrament of confirmation, in which the Holy Spirit is given for the increase of grace, and for spiritual strength of the soul against the assaults and battles of spiritual enemies. It also has moreover the sacrament of the Eucharist, the most excellent of all sacraments, in which under both kinds Christ truly contained provides the life of grace...

Page 226 — John of Turrecremata

...and is worthily received by those who worthily take it. John 6: The Savior Christ himself says: The bread which I will give, my flesh is for the life of the world. Also the same: if anyone shall have eaten of this bread he will live forever. It also has the sacrament of Penance, which is the second plank after shipwreck, and is the medicine of wounds and the hope of salvation; for through penance sinners are saved, through it God is provoked to mercy; and so concerning the other sacraments.

But the sect of Mohammed in this respect is more pernicious than all other sects; it has no Sacraments; although with diabolical cunning, so that Mohammed himself might be held as a keeper of both testaments, and thus as a prophet or Apostle or messenger of God, he orders the first sacrament of the old law, namely Circumcision, and the first of the new, namely Baptism, to be observed. For all those following this aforesaid accursed sect deviating are circumcised on the male side, and both men and women are washed with water.

But in both they manifestly err, nor do they hold any sacraments, but only a certain shadowy resemblance. For the Circumcision which is commanded to be done on the eighth day, in Leviticus 13, in adult age among the young and done by themselves — this predicated Circumcision is not of the Old Testament or Mosaic, but rather Ishmaelitic. In Baptism they similarly err...

Page 227 — On the Errors of Mohammed

...then as if doing similar things to the Jews, he says: Woe to you hypocrites who are like whitened sepulchres, which outwardly appear to men as beautiful, but inwardly are full of the bones of the dead and all filth; so you also appear just to men outwardly, but inwardly you are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.

Tenth the Christian faith or religion excels because it was introduced not by violence of arms, nor by tyrannical power, nor by sordid gain, nor by promises of earthly glory or carnal pleasure; but by humility, by patience, by miracles; also by the poor preaching, and inducing to the contempt of the world and the flight of pleasures. Whence in 1 Corinthians 1 the Apostle says: Behold your calling, brethren, that not many wise according to the flesh, not many powerful, not many noble; but what is foolish in the world God chose to confound the wise, and what is weak in the world God will choose to confound the strong; and what is ignoble in the world and contemptible God chose, and the things which are not, so that the things which are he might destroy; that no flesh might glory in his sight.

But the sect of Mohammed, as has been said above, was introduced by violence, by the power of arms, by oppression, by pillaging, by plunder, and by homicides planted and extended. If anyone from the side of Mohammed wishes to op-...

Page 228 — John of Turrecremata

...-pose, that Moses conquered the worshippers of idols — let him recall the signs and miracles which he performed in the law, and he will see that by the precept of the Lord he did this; similarly concerning Joshua the son of Nun, at whose word the Sun and Moon stood still. Which miracles cannot be done except by God — it is manifest that whatever those performed was done by the command of God. But Mohammed showed no miracle which might be in testimony that he should be believed, since his office was nothing other than to kill men, and plunder, and deceive strangers, and capture parents along with their children. Moreover those holy men at that time conquered the worshippers of idols. Mohammed and his followers persecute the people of

God, who worship one true God, the Creator of heaven and earth, and honor and praise him.

Eleventh the Christian faith excels because it has an existence of incorruptible firmness. Whence in Psalm 118 it is said: Forever, O Lord, your word remains; and Matthew 24 the Lord says: Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. But the sect of Mohammed does not have the firmness of duration, except insofar as it will endure among those through the power of arms and temporal faculty, as Mohammed himself testifies.

Twelfth the Christian faith excels because it has promises of ineffable happiness, which...

Page 229 — On the Errors of Mohammed

...is the vision of the face of the Omnipotent God and the sweetness of the perfect fruition of divinity: for he promises to his servants happiness itself, which the Angels have in heaven, which is truly ineffable: For what tongue can say, or what intellect is sufficient to understand how great the joys of supernal happiness are. To be present in the choirs of the Angels, to persevere always with the Blessed spirits, to see the face of God present, to see the uncircumscribed light, to be afflicted by no fear of death, to rejoice in perpetual incorruption. But the sect of Mohammed does not promise those who observe its law happiness except carnal and voluptuous, in drinks of wine, honey, and milk, and in luxuries, and in soft feather beds, as above in chapter 38 we noted, which are also common to brute animals.

These excellences of the Christian faith above every other sect — would that the Saracens and other infidels would attentively consider with sound eyes! For if they were to do so, we believe, if a true appetite for salvation were

present in them, illuminated by him who illuminates every man coming into this world, they would hasten with great devotion to the Christian religion.

THE REASON IS ASSIGNED WHY SO GREAT A MULTITUDE OF PEOPLES FLOWED TO THIS MOST CRIMINAL SECT OF Mohammed. Chapter XLIX.

Now since the Christian faith, as we showed above, is so privileged with so many excellences and nobility of prerogatives above all laws, and the sect of Mohammed is saturated with errors and filths, it will perhaps seem to some worthy of question: Why so great a multitude of men and peoples flowed to the said sect of Mohammed, especially since the natural reason of man, as the Philosopher says in book 1 of the Ethics, always seeks toward the best. But to this question an answer is easily given if the cunning and ways are considered by which with tricks Mohammed used for introducing his sect and by which he was able to cover his error and debase the truth of the Christian faith in the opinion of the foolish and ignorant men; about which, because we have already gone through many things above, we shall add a few. Now there were five ways or cunning tricks of Mohammed, which are con-...

Page 230 — John of Turrecremata

...-trary to the ways by which the Catholic faith was established; about which Thomas speaks in Contra Gentiles, chapter 6.

The first is that by promises of carnal pleasures he inflamed the desire and carnal longing of peoples to attract them; for he promised to those who observe his law a carnal law full of pleasures, such as he was preparing for

himself; there meats and the enjoyment of all kinds of fruits; there beds, rivers of milk, wine, and honey with streams splendidly flowing; there the embraces of the most beautiful women and Virgins, and luxuries, which is the highest paradise of his described; which he promises to all those obedient to himself, as we more fully touched upon in chapter 38. Whence it is no wonder if a carnal and bestial people followed him. The Christian faith on the contrary introduced; for it does not promise carnal things, does not promise pleasures of the flesh, but happiness such as the Angelic spirits themselves have, which is ineffable and incomprehensible, as above in the aforesaid chapter 38 we discussed.

The second way which Mohammed used for alluring peoples to his sect, is that he gave precepts conformable to promises, carnally relaxing the reins of pleasure, to whom it is easy for carnal men to obey. For as Tully narrates, Polienus blessed...

Page 231 — On the Errors of Mohammed

...-pleasure to be the good of evils, which seizes men as fish with a hook; and Virgil in the Bucolics: Pleasure draws each one. By this reason, as Lactantius says, the Epicurean discipline was far more celebrated than that of the others; not because it offered true good, but because it invited many to the name of pleasure, saying pleasure to be the highest good. Not so however did the Christian law proceed, in which carnal pleasures are most prohibited, and all things which are in the world are taught to be despised, which are truly sought by the whole multitude of men — as lusts and delights of the gullet, and worldly honors, by which the minds of mortals are most affected, as has been said. Whence 1 John 2: Do not love the world, nor the things which are in the world; if anyone loves the world, the love of the Father is not in him; since all

that is in the world is either the concupiscence of the flesh, or the concupiscence of the eyes, or the pride of life; by which exhortations to bring the minds of mortals to assent is the greatest miracle, and manifestly the work of divine inspiration; that having despised visible things, they might grasp invisible things alone.

Third the way in which Mohammed proceeded was that he offered no documents of truth except those which could easily be known by any man of moderate natural intelligence; indeed true things which he taught he mixed with fables and most foolish doctrines — such as that God is one and thus creator of all things, and that fear and honor should be shown to him. And that works of piety are to be exercised, which even a man of moderate intelligence can understand are to be done; and these things even without Mohammed himself writing them are more fully contained in the Gospel. But the law of the Christian Religion contains very many documents of truth divinely revealed to men, which exceed the power and faculty of the whole human intellect; such is the Trinity of persons in the unity of the Divine Essence, the secret of eternal generation, the mystery of the Divine Incarnation, and the ineffable sacrament of the Eucharist, and similar things, which all surpass the intellect of every creature; about which the Church says from Ecclesiasticus 3: Many things above the sense of man are shown to you; and the Prophet in Psalm 118: I will consider the wonders of your law; Also: Wonderful is your knowledge; it has been elevated from me, that is, to attain it from me. And 1 Corinthians 2: The things of God no one knows except the Spirit of God; but to us he has revealed them through the Holy Spirit.

Fourth, the way in which Mohammed proceeded in the propagation of his law, as we said in the preceding chapter, was tyrannical violence and the power of arms. For he adduced no supernaturally given signs; fitting testimony of divine inspiration is provided when visible operation, which can be nothing

but divine, shows the Teacher of truth invisibly inspired. Where it is to be noted that not certain wise men exercised in divine and human things from the beginning believed him; but bestial men dwelling in deserts, completely ignorant of all divine doctrine, by whose multitude, through violence of arms, he coerced others into his law.

The illustrious Christian Religion was however not thus introduced by the power of arms, as in the preceding chapter, because violence does not please God who is not served by violence because God does not delight in violent obedience; but by wonderful prodigies and visible works which surpass the power and faculty of the whole of nature, namely the marvelous curing of the languishing, the resurrection of the dead, the wonderful mutation of celestial bodies; and what is most wonderful, the inspiration of human minds: that idiots and simple ones, filled with the gift of the Holy Spirit, instantly obtained the highest wisdom and eloquence. Whence the Christians alone by their preaching, martyrdom, and miracles — not by any temporal force — brought the faith of Christ to all nations of the whole world, which the Prophet thus prophetically anticipated, saying: Their sound has gone out into all the earth, and their words to the ends of the world. Whence Lactantius says: Indeed no people so inhuman is there, no Religion so remote to whom either the possession of Christ or the sublimity of his Majesty is unknown.

Fifth the way which Mohammed used in the extension of his law was that, since no divine oracles of the preceding Prophets bear him testimony — but rather he depraves almost all documents of the Old and New Testament with fabulous narration, as is evident to those inspecting his Quran — with cunning counsel he did not leave the books of the Old and New Testament to his followers to be read, lest he should be convicted of falseness by them. On the contrary however, since the Christian faith has from the old law and from the oracles of the Prophets the clearest testimonies of its truth, Christ commands

the scriptures to be searched, saying in John 5: Search the scriptures. Those are they which bear testimony of me.

From which it is believed that a satisfactory answer is given to the question which was being asked: Why so great a multitude of peoples adhered to the sect of Mohammed full of errors and filths. Nor ought men who are members of the most noble Christian religion to marvel much; since as sacred scripture testifies, the number of the foolish is infinite, Ecclesiastes 1. And in Matthew 20 it is said: many are called but few are chosen; whence also the quantity of vile things is greater than precious ones, as iron more than lead, lead more than silver and gold, and fewer precious stones than non-precious ones.

But here it could disturb the minds of some: why did God permit that Mohammed should draw so many nations to his sacrilegious and most damnable law?

To this it could at the present be said that this happened on account of the sect of the Eastern Christians, Africans, and on account of the sins of idolaters and Jews. For that sect began in Arabia, and is destined in the East, and in the West in Africa. We know moreover that the Eastern Christians were for the most part in fact heretics in various heresies, namely of the Arians and of other heretics; as Jerome testifies writing to Damasus the Pope, and as is found in the chapter: Since the old East, and Africa in the heresy of the Donatists. In Arabia moreover the people were devoted to idols; and among these peoples many false Jewish enemies of Christ, because they were deservedly given over to a reprobate sense, so that they should be involved in the clouds of errors believing in lies. According to what the Apostle says in 2 Thessalonians 2: Because they did not receive the love of truth so that they might be saved. Therefore God will send them — that is, permit them to come into the operation of error — that they may believe in lying, that is in false doctrine, that all may be condemned — namely by the judgment of

condemnation — who did not believe in truth, but consented to iniquity, which we see fulfilled in Mohammed, as we see it fulfilled. It could also be that such a great extension of that sect has been attributed to the present sins and negligence of the Christians, whose charity has grown cold, so that almost no one wishes to labor for the glory of the name of Christ against those. Hence they grow continuously and spread themselves occupying most of the lands and dominions of the Christians, and the Christian people is diminishing; we plainly dare to say that just as on account of the sins of the Israelites the Ark of the Lord was delivered to the Philistines, so also on account of the sins of the Christians and ingratitude the Holy Land was given into the hands of the impious Saracens, and on account of the same demerits the Imperial City of Constantinople a few days ago together with many neighboring peoples, not without the greatest disgrace of Christendom, was subjected to the servitude of the Turks.

EXHORTATION OF THE CHRISTIAN PRINCES TO RISE UP AGAINST THE TURKS – The Last Chapter.

Since then, having run through by our mediocrity the refutations of errors which we have known repugn the holy Catholic faith more in the damnable sect of the treacherous Mohammed, we have come to the goal of our proposed task; it remains by God's gift, as much as our weakness allows, to close our treatise with a certain exhortation to the Christian Princes gathered at this diet, and in their persons to rouse the minds of their Religious men, that with all sloth set aside and all ignorance expelled, they may vigorously rise to extirpate the most damnable sect of Mohammed and his people, who with incredible ferocity endeavor to extinguish the faith of the Christians and the glorious name of Christ. Would that, especially first at the most clement divine source of authority, by the favor of our words, we might merit to gain

some fruit before God. I appeal therefore to you, most Inimitable Kings; I exhort and pray to the greatest Princes, and the rest of the magnates and Magnificent Lords, that you might sometime be excited against this most cruel enemy of Christ — I say the Turk — who by our mournful cry seeks to delete the name of Christ, and ardently burns to destroy the Christian Religion to the roots. To which four things should most especially move and induce your most noble minds. The first is the love of our Savior Jesus Christ, and zeal for his honor. The second is love of the Christian Republic. The third is your own honor and glory. The fourth is the magnitude of the reward promised to those serving in this holy service.

In the first place you most illustrious Princes ought to be excited to expunge this enemy of Christ and destroyer of the Christian Religion. The love of God and of your Savior, whom you are bound to love with your whole heart, your whole soul and all your faculties: plainly if you love as you ought to, being perfectly zealous, you will not tolerate his honor and injuries and blasphemies patiently. For the Lord says in Malachi 1: If then I am a Father, where is my honor? And the holy Prophet David says: Do I not hate those who hate you, O Lord, and was I not displeased over your enemies? And the same: The zeal of your house has consumed me, and the reproaches of those reproaching you have fallen upon me; plainly whoever truly loves him fears to expose himself to no danger for defending his honor, does not care for ignominy, does not feel torments, does not finally fear death. For charity, as the Evangelist John says, expels fear. And as Tully says: No just man can exist who fears death, who fears exile, who fears poverty. Truly he seems excluded from the love of God who can repel the injuries of God and neglects it. For if, as Ambrose testifies in the book on offices: He who does not repel an injury from a companion when he is able is as guilty as he who did it. What do you think, O most illustrious Princes, if the injuries, if the reproaches, if the blasphemies of your God and Savior of ours Jesus Christ you are able to repel, you have neglected

to repel. Hear what the holy Popes Anastasius and Damasus say: He who is able to obstruct the perverse, and does not do it, is nothing other than to favor the impiety of those. Note well what Ambrose says: What do we worthy refer to our Creator, whose food we feed upon, and we dissimulate his injuries etc.

How great do you think, most distinguished Lords and Princes, you come worthy of condemnation, when among yourselves you contend with a wonderful ardor and fury of your passions to avenge injuries to yourselves, so that for vindicating those you do not fear to undergo dangers and deaths, and the injuries and blasphemies of Christ the Lord our Savior, whose kingdom and dominions you hold, you pass by with damnable patience? Let what Hieronymus says be fulfilled: We persecute the enemies of adversaries with mortal hatred, we extend a hand to those who blaspheme the clement God. Not thus, O most Christian Princes, do you wish to act; but rise up against that most filthy people of the Turks, who, besides this that they violently occupy the Holy Land honored by the presence of our Savior — where the Christian Religion had its origin and source, whence the streams of Evangelical and Apostolic doctrine flowed into the whole world, the holy altar on which the immaculate Lamb Christ was immolated for the redemption of the human race — blasphemies against Christ do not cease; for he denies the divinity of Christ, the royal majesty, the piety of the Incarnation, the saving death, the judicial authority, and the other sacraments of faith he derides, and beyond this he performs the greatest persecutions continuously on the Christian people. Arouse yourselves (most illustrious Princes) to fight for our faith, for the glory of our Savior.

Moreover, second, you most illustrious Princes ought to be moved to expunge this most bitter enemy by the love of the Christian Republic, as we are instructed by the examples of the ancients. Among the ancients there was concern for the Republic to be preserved and augmented, so that for its

salvation it was not to be spared from any dangers, any labors, or any inconveniences. For if those Pagans said there was no danger to be avoided for the sake of their Republic — that is for the salvation of their own people — not redeemed by the precious blood of Christ, not regenerated by his sacraments, not vivified by his life, and only for temporal salvation from carnal love of country and desire of praise, not for the salvation of souls, not for the honor of God — they have acted thus. What ought Christian Princes to do for the Christian Republic namely for the Christian people of Christ, redeemed by his blood and chosen by him and called by his admirable name, about which the Prince of the Apostles says: You are this chosen race, royal Priesthood, holy nation, a people of acquisition, 1 Peter 2. For which people you most illustrious Princes ought to arise all the more ardently and freely, the greater and more perilous damages the most serious enemies of the Christian Republic — the Turks — now wish to afflict; for it is not the matter of one city or of any most opulent kingdom, but the matter of the whole Christian faith is being conducted. For the damage of faith is believed to be the most detestable by this, since if faith is deficient nothing profits that is held further. No greater riches, Augustine says, no treasure, no greater substance of this world than the Catholic faith. Are you not aware, most pious Princes, that your neighbors perish not only in body but also in soul? O how many there are, alas, Christians who are in servitude to the Turks, attracted by pleasure, or seduced by persuasions, or broken by the fear of torments, forsaking the faith of Christ without which there is no salvation, damnably apostatized. Who moreover without a flood of tears can commemorate the damages, inconveniences, sorrows, anxieties, anguishes, lamentations, infamies, derisions, vituperations, pillages, violence, servitudes and deaths brought upon Christians by Turks, their cities devastated, their temples demolished and profaned, all the ornaments of the Christian Religion by those impious dogs trodden under their feet? O unworthy deed, O injuries not to be suffered, O

crimes to be endured by no pact patiently. Plainly most illustrious Princes, if in the breasts of yours in the Christian Republic of your proximate neighbors — whom as your teacher Christ teaches you ought to love — Charity yields to no labor, no danger, and will not be sparing even of death for the safety of your Republic. Consider that as Christ was able to lay down his soul for us, and we ought to lay down our souls for our brothers, 1 John 3. Hear I pray you what the illustrious Prince Judas Maccabee says to the Leaders and Tribunes and Centurions of his people: Get ready and be prepared in the morning so that you may fight against these nations, which have gathered to destroy us and our sanctuary, since it is better for us to die in battle than to see the evil of our people and our saints, 1 Maccabees 3. Do you not see, excellences of yours (most outstanding Princes), that this most courageous enemy does not sleep, but attacks us most swiftly with a most robust army, with a most truculent spirit, with things most prepared against us by a direct route? What then are you waiting for? What do you expect? Or will this Dragon of Christ make the Church its prey? Indeed rather wake up, and show the forces of your Republic — which owes due tuition and defense — that a greater danger of condemnation certainly threatens you to be defended; as Blessed Isidore says: Not only of the Spaniards but the Church commands individually, as is found in the chapter of Princes 23 question 5: Let the princes of the secular world know they must render an account to God for the Church, which they receive under Christ to protect. For either peace is augmented and ecclesiastical discipline is preserved by faithful Princes, or if it is dissolved — namely by Christ — he will demand account from those under whose power he entrusted his Church.

Moreover, third, the excellences of yours, most Illustrious Princes, ought to move to defend the Christian Republic, namely your own honor, which the nobler you are, the more valued you ought to have. Now the highest safety of military service, as Gregory says among other goods, is this: to exhibit

obedience to the affairs and utilities of the Republic. Also Vegetius testifies that among other things the sacrament of military service contains that they would never desert military service nor refuse death for the Republic. This therefore very much pertains to the honor of the Prince toward the safety of the Christian Republic, to be careful and to fight the better for its tuition. Hence always in adversities it was customary among Christian Kings and Emperors to request auxiliary help against the enemies of the faith, as Augustine says in the greatest chapter, and in the chapter of the priest 23 question 5, and the Carthaginian Council, for the same reason and question, that it is the greatest ignominy of Christian Princes and soldiers if they are found negligent about the tuition of the Christian Republic. Wherefore for your honor, most Illustrious Princes, excite yourselves against the Turks in defense of your Republic, and take upon yourselves the everlasting glory of praise. Especially since it is most clearly evident, in military art and experience, in magnanimity and splendor of arms, you are far more excellent than those. Moreover it is established that your peoples are industrious, sagacious, provident, brave, virile, robust, constant, upright, and most apt for all matters to be undertaken; that the race of Barbarians is unarmed, ignoble, vile, timid, confused, inconstably fugitive, effeminate in attire and masked, and by all good men the greatest part deserving of derision; and also because your cause is more just and more holy — who doubts when that barbarous people of Mohammed exalts, extols, and protects the most criminal inventor of all vileness, of the most filthy lusts, and the renewer of all heresies; and you choose and adore the one true God the Creator of heaven and earth, the true Son of God the most holy man, and you defend and protect his Religion full of all virtues. Also you ecclesiastical Princes and Rectors of souls, whom Christ specially made participants of his honor, wake up and see that the sheep committed to you are being torn apart by Wolves — that is, by Turks — are seized and most cruelly killed. Consider that as a good Pastor, according to the

doctrine of our teacher, lays down his soul for his sheep, the Prelates of substance are much more bound to give their soul. Moreover it seems to pertain to your charity, in the present so great necessity of the Christian people, that from ecclesiastical goods the expenses of soldiers be lavishly supplied; for as Blessed Ambrose says: The Church has gold not that she might keep it but that she might expend, and in necessities be present. Plainly if it is recognized that the crime of sacrilege is the act of not distributing the possessions of the poor to the poor, the rich Prelates of sacrilegious cruelty would come to be argued who in such great necessity of the Church refused to be present.

Moreover fourth I urge you, O most Illustrious Princes, you ought to be moved and vehemently inflamed to this often-commemorated pious work by the excellence of the reward, which is promised to those who labor in this sacred service by the very King of Kings, Christ our Savior. For if among secular Princes a soldier merits to be praised with great praises by him who serves courageously for the honor of his Lord, or the defense of his country, fights bravely, drives off enemies in battle, persevering all the way so that he fully triumphs over the enemy — how much more are the most excellent rewards of singular honor, immortal crown, and glory in this life and greater in another life to be expected from the highest King, who is of infinite and ineffable magnificence, from those themselves who from divine love and devotion of faith expose themselves against the enemies of the faith. On account of which Bernard says to such Soldiers: Proceed safely, Soldiers, and with intrepid spirit drive off the enemies of the cross of Christ; and it follows: How gloriously do victors return from battle, how blessedly do Martyrs die in battle. And Leo the Fourth Pope, writing to the army of the Franks, as in chapter "all" 23 question 8: Thus, he says, with all fear and horror set aside, against the enemies of the holy Faith and adversaries of all Religions, act vigorously, knowing that the omnipotent One knows that if any of yours dies,

he dies for the truth of the faith and the salvation of his country and the defense of Christians. Therefore the heavenly reward is obtained from him, about which the Apostle says in 1 Corinthians 2: Eye has not seen, nor has ear heard, nor has it ascended into the heart of man, what God has prepared for those who love him.

PRAISE TO GOD.

— END OF TRANSLATION —

Let it be printed if it pleases the Most Reverend Father Master of the Sacred Palace. By Gypsius, the Vicar-General. Let it be printed. By Brother John Maria, Master of the Sacred Apostolic Palace.

Printed in Rome, by Guilielmi Facciotti, 1606